DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 538 HE 017 241

TITLE	Public Hearing on Teaching and Teacher Education (Atlanta, Georgia, May 12, 1982).
INSTITUTION	National Commission on Excellence in Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	12 May 82
NOTE	251p.; For related documents, see ED 225 996, ED 227 096, and HE 017 237-244.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Policy; *Educational Quality; Hearings; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; State Government; Teacher Centers; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Participation; *Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*National Commission on Excellence in Education; United States (South)

ABSTRACT

Views concerning teaching and teacher education and the pursuit of excellence in education are expressed in a 1982 public hearing. Attention is directed to the following concerns: the nature of effective teaching, the preparation of an effective teacher, keeping the teacher effective, the responsibility for providing and sustaining excellence in teaching, and resources that are required to achieve this task. An overview of research that relates to teaching and teacher education is provided, along with philosophical views on the improvement of education as a practical activity. The components of a teacher education program are also outlined, and current state policies affecting teacher quality in instruction are addressed. Attention is directed to the specific issues of teacher certification and teacher trainee programs at colleges and universities. Additional topics include: the selection of teachers in Southern states, testing of teachers, attracting talented people to the teaching profession, the quality of preservice teacher education, teacher centers for inservice training, a proposal to establish a 1- to 3-year internship program for teachers, the teaching environment, and the need for more teacher involvement and teacher control. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

[illegible]

ED244538

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PUBLIC HEARING

on

TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Urban Life Center
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

May 12, 1982
8:50 a.m.

Reported by:
SALLY SANBORN

SP017 241

I N D E X

SPEAKER	PAGE NO.
Mr. Gary Sykes	12
Mr. Gary Fenstermacher	21
Mr. David Imig	34
Ms. Anne Flowers	36
Ms. Barbara Peterson	46
Mr. Robert Scanlon	56
Ms. Eva Galumbos	77
Mr. Ralph Torlington	89
Ms. Gail MacColl	122
Ms. Kathy Jones	137
Ms. Mary Lou Romaine	143
Ms. Janet Towslee Collier	150
Mr. Robert Fortenberry	154
Mr. Nicholas Hobar	159
Mr. Fred Loveday	166
Ms. Carolyn Huseman	174
Mr. Sam Yarger	178
Mr. Robert Fonteneau	207
Ms. Mary Ramzer	212
Mr. Eugene Kelly, Jr.	217
Mr. Richard Hodges	223
Mr. James Grey	226
Mr. Robert Dickson	231
Ms. Pat Woodall	238
Mr. Wayne Wheatley	241

PROCEEDINGS

8:50 a.m.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Well, good morning and welcome to the Third Hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Education.

On behalf of the Commission, I would like to express sincere graditude for the hospitality, tremendous southern hospitality, that we received last night and all day yesterday, and particularly to Superintendent Grimm and to Deans, Hadden and Day. They, and numerous members of their respective staffs, have treated us royally, to say the least.

We would, also, like to thank the Regional Office here in Atlanta where Ted Freeman serves as Secretary Bell's Regional Representative. And, of course, our Washington staff members, headed by Executive Director, Milt Goldberg -- here Milt -- continues to provide us with the support services that make our numerous endeavors possible.

As you may know, Secretary Bell, announced the creation of the National Commission on Excellence in Education in Washington in August of 1981. Soliciting the support of all who care about our future, the Secretary noted that he was establishing the Commission based on his responsibility to provide leadership, constructive criticism, and effective assistance to schools and universities. The Commission's official charter requires the Commission to pay particular attention to several areas including, assessing the quality of teaching and learning in our nation's public and private schools, colleges, and universities; comparing American schools and colleges with those of other advanced nations; studying the relationship between college admission requirements and high school curricular and standards; identifying exceptionally effective educational programs and searching for sources of their success; accessing the degree to which many a social and educational changes in the last quarter of a century have effected student achievement; holding hearings and receiving testimony on how to foster higher levels of quality in the nation's educational system; and isolating the problems which must be faced and overcome if we are to, successfully, pursue the course of excellence in education. I can see from the Commission's chart our task is a monumental one.

We will need the cooperation of the American public as well as the American educational community. For, we will also need your testimony in order to be able to make the sensitive assessments required for intelligent and practical recommendations, and later, we will need your cooperation to implement those recommendations.

Creation of the Commission establishes the fact that we need to pay special attention to a number of problems that we are now facing in education. In short, we are not doing as well as we should. This recognition should not signal a sense of desperation; rather, we should take it as evidence of our resolve to solve these problems.

Our agenda for today, teaching and teacher education, is a critical and important focus for the Commission. Under this topic we will consider a number of pressing national issues in education including; what is effective teaching, what does it take to create an effective teacher, what does it take to keep that teacher effective and to keep that person in the profession, where does the responsibility lie for providing and sustaining excellence in teaching, and what resources are required to achieve this task. We look forward to what our witnesses will have to tell us today and the other topics before us as well.

I would now like to introduce the Vice Chairman of the Commission, Yvonne Larsen, who will introduce the Commission members.

Thank you for being here.

MS. LARSEN: Thank you very much, Ms. Kirk.

On behalf of the National Creation on Excellence in Education and it's Chairman, Dr. David Gardner, who is President of the University of Utah, I bid you welcome and extend to you our sincere greetings and our appreciation for your attendance at this Third Hearing of our National Commission on Excellence.

As Ms. Kirk mentioned, we did come into existence in August, of 1981. We were sworn into office on October 9th of 1981, by Secretary Bell with the awesome challenge to make recommendations to the nation and to the Secretary, to promote excellence in public and private education in the K-12 schools, colleges, and universities. This Commission consists of 18 unique individuals with a variety of experiences and various levels of expertise, and it is a very dynamic group of people who are interacting in the most positive ways to improve what we see are challenges within the education to respond to the needs of each individual student. May I present to you at this point in time the Commission members who are in attendance today.

Margaret Marston, who is a member of the Virginia Board of Education -- State Board of Education, is the first one here to my left.

Then we have Mr. Emeral Crosby, who is the Principal of Northern High School, in Detroit, Michigan.

You have met our Chairwoman for today, Annette Kirk, who is the Parent Representative on the Commission. She hails from La Costa, Michigan. Everyone always wants to know, where is La Costa.

Next, we have Mr. Jay Sommer, who is this year's National Teacher of the Year. A gentleman who speaks 10 languages and is learning some more.

And, finally, to my left is Mr. Charles A. Foster, the President of the Foundation for Teaching Economics, for teaching economics, from San Francisco.

We do feel that public education is at a crossroads and our work will be challenging. To this -- in this area we have established 6 individual hearings. Our first was at Stanford on March 10th, and it was chaired by eminent Dr. Glynn Seabork. It was on the topic of math, science, and technology.

Next we went to Houston in April and our topic was "Literacy, Language, and Foreign Language".

Today we address the issue of "Teacher and Teacher Education".

On June 23rd we will meet in Chicago, where we will address the topic of "Admission Standards for Higher Education".

In September we will be in Denver to discuss "Vocational Education, Work Experience".

In October on the 15th we will be in Boston, which the subject will be "The gifted and Talented".

We've had a very busy day and a half in Atlanta. Yesterday we visited two extremely fine schools from the Atlanta school district, May High School and Douglas High School. They are both very different but both very informative.

Last night we had the pleasure of meeting with some of the business and educational leaders of the Atlanta community -- community to discuss partnership, "The Atlanta Partnership of Business and Education". And we think that it has a potential to be a pilot project. That perhaps we will be able to articulate to a lot of other communities, and they can learn from this experience.

We're finding that our discussion on "Excellence in Education" is creating a ripple effect from coast to coast because wherever we go there are a variety of sessions, seminars, panels, et cetera that are discussing the issue of excellence and we think that's great.

Our final report that is due a little less than a year from now, we would challenge to prepare a document that will not be a dust collector but will be a vital living document and that is the challenge that we have accepted. Through this we know that the best thing is for all of us to be advocates together, and through the collective wisdom we think that we will be able to turn this junction in the road which we see at the crossroads in the future of American education into a very possitive constructive issue.

We have some staff members that I'd like to identify at this point in time. The two people who put together today's hearing, Mr. Drew -- Mr. Lebbie Drew are you in the

-- over here to my left, and Cheryl Chase who is in the back of the room. They have worked very diligently on this hearing and we're greatful for their expertise.

Also, from the staff, Ms. Susan Tramon, who is back here in the second row to my left. Then you have Doctor Milt Hobart. Milt would you please stand up and be recognized. Milt is our Executive Director and coordinates our activities.

And Mr. Tony Morgan is representing Dr. David Gardner who is our President. Tony is here in the front of the room.

Yesterday afternoon between our visitations to the site and our dinner with the Atlanta Leadership Organization, we received some input on some papers that are being presented -- or being prepared to help us in the area of teacher education and teacher preparation. And these are by very dynamic gentlemen who are going to participate, also, if they are so inclined, in seeking some questions and some answers from our very impressive list of presenters. So they will interact with us, also, this morning at their convenience. And they are Mr. -- or Dr. William Gardner from the University of Minnesota, Dr. Sam Yarbrough from the University of Syracuse, and Dr. Kenneth Howie from the University of Minnesota. In addition, Dr. John Palmer from the University of Wisconsin is not in attendance but he is working on these papers with them.

So, having given you that background, I will now turn the discussion back to Ms. Kirk who will present the agenda for this morning.

Thank you very much for you attendance.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We're not too far off schedule. I trust that we can keep this proceeding relatively informal. A stenographer is present who will keep a record of the exchanges between the witnesses and the commission. We can proceed in the following manner. Each witness will have 15 minutes in which to make a statement. I hope that all of you will be able to summarize your prepared remarks in that amount of time. Your complete statement will be included in the written record of the hearing. We have a small electronic device here. We hope it doesn't scare you too much. It will beep after 12 mon -- minutes. We decided not to use the one for the gym. It might be too frightening.

After we have heard the statements from all the speakers, we will have an hour of questions from the Commission members and comments by the members of the panel regarding the remarks of other panelists. So all of you are invited to question each other so be ready.

From 12 to 1:30 the members of the audience will be free to take a lunch break as this time period will be devoted to a short press availability session, and lunch provided by our host here in Atlanta for the Commission members and the morning experts.

This afternoon after our lunch recess, we will here from individuals who will tell us about programs, problems, and solutions in teaching and teacher education. I will announce the names of these individuals when we reconvene after lunch.

During the latter part of the afternoon, there will be time for members of the audience to present 5 minutes of testimony of specific examples of educational excellence. These statements may address either today's topic or other topics related to the pursuit of educational quality. If you are interested in testifying during this time, please fill out an index card at the registration table during the morning coffee break. The schedule will be announced before lunch. We urge everyone who is interested in testifying to submit testimony in writing since we can only hear from a limited number of individuals today. The record for written testimony from organizations and individuals will remain open until June 12th.

As you can see our agenda is so full that no breaks have been scheduled. However, I will call 10 minute breaks in the morning and in the afternoon as time permits. Now, let us start the morning's proceedings. In order to help the recorder would you please began by identifying yourself and your institution.

Our first speaker will be Gary Sykes.

MR. SYKES: I'm Gary Sykes. I am a Research Associate of the National Institute of Education. I've been asked today to provide a brief tour of research that relates to teaching and teacher education to set a tone for the hearing. That's a -- that's a tall charge in 15 minutes and I would invite any who would like to see more detailed references to my remarks to simply ask for my paper which is in preparation.

I titled what I wanted to say today "Opportunities in an Era of Diversity". It seems to me that we will hear today predominantly about the problems confronting teaching and teacher education in the eighties. I wanted to set a more upbeat on -- by emphasizing that adversity often is a stimulus for invention and creative response to problems. And that we could as well ask, what are -- what are the most promising opportunities that we could seize upon in the coming era to improve education. And to come to my conclusion, first, I also want to suggest that the chief impediment to realizing the promise of some of the opportunities I want to briefly touch on this morning, may not be the lack of resources, so much as a political stalemate that currently exists within the field of education, defined by a large group of stakeholders who haven't figured out how to work well together with one another. And, in some ways, I see this political stalemate, a force field that prevents significant change in any direction, because each stakeholder group has a veto power, but no one group can -- can move in a positive direction, as -- as the most significant problems that we're facing today. And that the resource, consequently, in shortest supply, is statesmanship and leadership. We have to have that. We have to have a way for labor and management, for the growth of academe and the realities of daily schooling, for the various levels within the Government's hierarchy, to figure out how to resolve their differences and agree upon an agenda.

I think the term "crisis" tends to be overused in education. There is, today, a familiar litany of problems. I almost have a sense in which, if we are in a crisis today, with respect to teaching and teacher education, it's a crisis that has been ongoing for the last one hundred twenty years, namely, roughly since the beginning of the public educational system in this country. These are not new problems, but I think it's probably useful to start with a very brief recounting of what some of these problems are.

Let me talk first about recruitment, selection, and retention in teaching. There is evidence that, in terms of academic ability, at every point of choice from entrance into a teacher education program to graduation from a teacher education program, the selection of teaching as a career, to staying in the career, teaching tends to lose the most academically able. And that's probably the single piece of evidence that is getting the greatest amount of play today. There is much more that could be said about this; how important are teacher test scores for the quality of their teaching. And it's a matter of enormous controversy. I hope others today will address the point in more detail than I'm able to at the moment.

But the fact is that there is a widespread perception that teaching, as an occupation, as a profession, is having difficulty attracting the best and the brightest, and holding them in this profession. And, clearly, that's a problem that the Commissioners, and many others, are worried about today. I would just add, however, that we have a long history, in terms of some of these indicators, test scores, grade point average, and so on, that this is not a new problem. And our educational system has served us tolerably well.

I think it's fair to say, on another matter, that there is a problem emerging. It would appear, by the best -- best current estimates, that by the mid to late eighties we will have a shortage of teachers, a general shortage of teachers. I think the most significant trends tend to be on the supply, rather than the demand side of it. The number of undergraduates opting for education as a major has been declining since 1972 and, equally important, the 18 to 24 year old age cohort is shrinking. So that education is drawing a declining number of undergraduates from a shrinking pool of undergraduates in four year institutions. And it appears that very shortly, as there is an upturn in enrollments, student enrollments, first at the elementary, and then at the secondary level, many communities will be having real difficulties hiring teachers. Already there are serious shortages in math and science, something that the Commissioners have heard about, so I won't -- I won't elaborate on that. But, of course, that's -- that's a serious problem that is with us already.

It's impossible to talk about teacher shortages, recruitment problems into teaching, without considering the rewards of this profession. And I think that's another major area of difficulty that is attracting a lot of attention today.

By a number of analyses, teacher salaries appear to be inadequate. They are not attracting people. But, in some ways, I think the other sorts of rewards that have traditionally attracted people to the profession, are also declining. I'm speaking now of the prestige and status of teachers in many communities. I'm speaking of security, job security threatened with reductions in force in many communities. I'm speaking of the intrinsic rewards of teaching which, of course, are central to why people go into teaching. They receive rewards from students; they receive rewards from administrators and from colleagues who encourage them to do -- to do their best. And there is ample evidence, I think, that many teachers today are experiencing those intrinsic rewards as being depressing and discouraging. They aren't there. And I think that, as much as some of the material rewards, are what are discouraging people from entering the profession and from remaining in it. And we have to do something about rewards if we are to attract and hold people in the profession.

Teacher working conditions is another major topic. Sociologists of work have emphasized a series of features about teaching that are of long-standing significance, and these include the lack of (indistinmguishable) in the profession. Low collegiality. The lack of feedback on isolation of the classroom; the lack of a technical subculture; uncertainty of means and a profusion of ends, that teachers are trying to pursue. These are long-standing problems that face teacher work. And I want to say something, in a moment, about the end roads that are being made on some of these things.

Another set of problems have to with the management of teaching. And here, I think, there are a series of external forces that have begun to influence teacher work from outside. I think one of the most pronounced developments over the last decade has been the effects of unionization and collective bargaining. Again, a controversial topic, with allegations on both sides about whether unionization has improved the conditions of teaching or whether, in some ways, it undercut public sympathy and support for teachers, volunteerism, and so on. That's a serious problem, but the impact of unionization, in terms of the research evidence, is not at all clear. What is clear is that it's having an impact.

Another major development is in the growth of external constraints on teaching. Here I'm talking about the growth of Federal and State policy of all sorts, and the extent to which, over the past decade, there's been tremendous turmoil in many schools across the country, compounded by court ordered desegregation, 94142, bilingual education, OCR required integregation of staffs, and a series of other mandates that have come down from the Federal and State level, that have deeply influenced the organization and running of the Nation's schools. And that's been a significant trend in many schools.

And, finally, I'll just say a few words about some of the perceptions of difficulty with teacher preparation. The charges are that standards in teacher preparation aren't sufficiently high; that it is a stigmatized profession on most college campuses, with other faculties within the university culture tending to look down on the school of education; that pre-service is poorly related to the realities of daily work for teachers; that the fundamental dilemma in pre-service education is that there simply is not enough time and money to do all that teacher educators are asked to do. And that, without additional resources, they can't demonstrate that it could be a strong, effective means of improving teaching. And that, finally, that the articulation between pre-service and in-service education, as we can fragment it, I think most people who know anything about school districts recognize that staff development has -- tends to be the first item on the school budget that gets cut. There's very little of real commitment on the part of administrators to serious on-going work with teachers on the job, and that this is a major problem with the continuing professional development of teachers.

Well, let me briefly conclude by indicating some of what I think are the major opportunities to confront some of these problems. I think, first of all, that we tend to underestimate the amount of local inventiveness that goes on with respect to problems. And it's very easy for a National Commission, looking across the entire country, to assume that it must come up with solutions to problems. It seems to me much more likely that in fifteen thousand school districts, and eighty-six thousand schools in the country, that we can count on a considerable amount of local inventiveness in dealing with problems. And that, if there is a role for the type of a policy system, it may be to encourage, stimulate, and speed the spread of good ideas generated at the local level. So, for example, I would anticipate, over the next decade, that solutions to problems of math and science teachers, may not be generated from the Federal and State level, so much as at the local level. There are dozens and dozens of unique and creative responses to the critical shortage of those teachers. And partly, we can simply pay homage to local inventiveness and count on that. We underestimate the adaptability of our large, strong, and centralized school system.

I think, too, that we can count in the coming decade on enlightened management. There are a series of lessons that are coming now to us from the experiences of Japan, Scandanavian work experiments, and our own research on effective schools, about good management, good management of personnel in any line of work. And I think that part of what will improve teaching, will be more effective management, that will improve the conditions under which teachers work.

I will not go into anymore detail on that, but I think it's an important trend that we need to pay attention to.

Two other points I want to make. One is the prospects for increased professionalism in teaching. I think there are two powerful norms that any school could begin working on immediately. These are inquiry and collegiality. I think one of the most powerful ways that -- and again, this comes from -- from a wide scattered body of research -- but one of the most powerful ways that we can make teaching a more rewarding and more effective line of work, would be to increase the extent to which teachers inquire into their own practices in common with other teachers, so that teachers become reflective inquirers about their own practices. But that has to be institutionalized within schools, and we can do that.

And finally, I want to simply point to the prospects for clarity and consensus about the role of secondary schools, as -- as a critical issue. I think that the work of the National Commission, together with about a dozen other major studies of secondary schooling going on today, holds some promise that, in our society as a whole, a dialogue about what the secondary school is for, will begin to focus in on a more delimited set of goals and purposes, that will help to focus the work of teachers and administrators in the secondary schools, more than they have been in the past decade of fragmentation of purpose and confusion of ends over what -- what our secondary schools are supposed to be about.

And I think, if we could achieve greater clarity and consensus, on a delimited set of purposes, those institutions could be infinitely more effective, and teachers, in turn, could -- could regain confidence and satisfaction in their work.

Let me stop there. Thank you.

Two questions I guess.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Yes, we are going to allow two clarifying questions at this time and we'll have the discussion later on after the break -- then you can ask some more indepth questions. But at this point, if there is anything that Gary has said that needs clarification or some short comment we'd welcome that at this time.

If not, we'll wait until the discussion period. We have to assimulate all that he said.

MS. LARSEN: That was very good. Thank you again.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Gary.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: May I speak from here or would you prefer the podium?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I don't think it makes any difference. It's your choice.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: Okay. Thank you.

Madam Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Gary Fenstermacher. I'm from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. It is an honor to be asked to speak to you on some aspects of the relationships between teaching and learning.

Before preceeding to this topic, I would like to provide some contexts for my testimony. I am a Philosopher of Education by training and I hope by habits of mind. For the last decade I have been particularly interested in the study of teaching. This interest includes the study of research on teaching as well as analysis of policies effecting teaching practices. I have worked as a teacher educator and administrator of teacher education programs and an ex officio member of the California Commission for teacher preparation and licensing.

The remarks that follow are based on my concerns as a Philosopher and as someone interested in the improvement of education as a practical activity. You are already aware of what some have called the "crisis in learning". School youth on the average appear to be making little progress or are falling behind on such measures as college admission tests, national assessments of educational progress, and the various basic skills and competency tests of the several states. The media forcefully direct our attention to these problems by publishing or broadcasting testscores, critical commentary, news of teacher strikes and student delinquency, and dramatic court decisions bearing on the conduct of schools.

Many citizens are disturbed by the sense of what is happening in our schools. We have for so long conceived of the schools as the foundation for the American dream; that any perceived deterioration in their stature and effectiveness become for us sources of disappointment and frustration. However, I do not believe that the situation is so bleak as it seems at first. A few items of common sense may help balance our frames of reference.

First, it should not be forgotton that the schools, especially the American common school, have long been the subject of great debates. This era is not the first one in which citizens have expressed strong mixed emotions about the schools. From Thomas Jefferson, through Horace Mann, John Dewey, and James Coleman; Americans have argued the basis for schooling and the results it produces. What is, I believe, different about the debate in which we are now engaged, is that it is taking place at state and federal levels rather than primarily at local and state levels. It is magnified and emphasized by print and broadcast media which exercise enormous national influence. And this is the first time in our history that we have argued the issues with so much concrete data from testing and evaluation programs. The combination of national scale, influential media, and voluminous data contribute to our perception that matters may be worse than ever. Yet it is possible that schooling is rather much like it has always been, perhaps doing pretty much what it has always done with but context and surrounding circumstances different from those in earlier times.

The second item of common sense is that not all that one learns or fails to learn can be attributed to the schools or teachers. Socialization and culturation outside the school account for a significant portion of what any child learns. Even the socialization that takes place in the school but which cannot be controlled by school personnel such as peer-group affiliations may be as powerful an influence on learning as those environmental influences which can be controlled by school authorities.

Yet another common sense consideration is that we have over the last 100 years called upon the schools to do much for society. We continue to ask of our schools and teachers that they take up the slack left by the gradual abandonment of children and youth by other social institutions such as the home, the community, and the work place. Taking up this slack amounts to installing more and more programs in schools to teach children, what they at one time learned from far broader opportunities, to participate in social and economic affairs. Such programs include career awareness in job training, nutrition studies, expanded physical education, driver training, multicultural awareness, and many other activities that have been packed into the school day in the hopes that youth would gain from them what they can no longer gain from living in extended families, in nearly self sufficient rural environments, and in close proximity to working adults. If I am correct in identifying these three items as matters of some common sense, they lead us to consider two possibilities. The crisis in learning may not be so profound and distructive as we might at first believe. And to the extent that there is a crisis, we are all participants in it's creation and maintenance. When we contend that the schools are not in a state of good health, the teachers are not doing for children what they should be doing; we are evaluating more than schools and teachers. We are also evaluation -- evaluating the nation's state of health and the nature of our own social condition. For the realities of schooling are little more than we, as citizens, have constructed for the schools. They have served as lightening rods for our social, political, and economic storms. Whereby we have tried to correct our perceived national deficiencies by asking the schools to make right, through our youth, what we sense is now not right among adults. If we possessed instruments powerful and sophisticated enough to measure the totality of learning in schools, I would speculate, and it is indeed speculation since such instruments are beyond our grasps at this time, that children are learning just about what we have made it possible for them to learn. Notice I am not saying that children are learning what we want them to learn or what we think they should be learning. I am saying that children are learning what we have made it possible for them to learn by the way we have chosen to construct our system of schooling and have filled it with courses, programs, schedules, personnel, and facilities. Given these thoughts the challenge to anyone who would improve the relationship between teaching and learning is to achieve a better alignment between what we have made it possible for children to learn and what it is we want children to learn.

On the surface this idea seems simple enough yet it implies a great deal more than immediately meets the eye. To think of the improvement of schooling as the achievement of a better alignment between what we have made it possible for schools to do and what we want schools to do is to think in a way that does not cast dispersions or lay blame. Rather it is to presume that educators have tried to make the best of possibilities that society has permitted them. To think of the problem as one of discrepancy between what is now possible and what ought soon to be is to avoid the pitfall of thinking that the system can be improved by shaking up everyone in it while leaving their possibilities and potentials unchanged. More tests, more accountability, better management, and stricter standards have little if any impact on changing possibilities and potential, rather they seem more like punishments. And to depend excusively on them is to forget that social and cultural circumstances in and out of school determine far more of what children learn than auditing and control devices used to run the schools themselves.

Thus the question before all of us is how we can alter the possibilities and potentials of schooling to achieve what we want the schools to achieve. In coming to grips with this question, two subsidiary questions become obvious. What possibilities and potentials are now open to schools and school personnel, and what is it that we want schools and school personnel to accomplish. There is much enlighten scholarship and common wisdom around proporting to answer the first question about possibilities and potentials, and there is a huge philosophical literature and a lot of practical advice for answering the second question. Unfortunately, the answers are not at all consistent, nor are they equally worth our consideration. This is the reason I am sure your task as a commission is so vexing and difficult.

If my testimony were to be of any value to you, it should ease a bit the puzzling and complex character of the task confronting you. I hope I have made the tiniest contribution to that labor by placing some of the problems about teaching and learning in a bit more comprehensible prospective. I shall try to do something more by offering a few suggestions on how you might enlarge the possibilities and potentials for teaching and learning.

When parents, taxpayers, policy makers, and senior school administrators dwell excusively on basic skills as the fundamental task of schooling; they, perhaps unwittingly, limit the possibilities for teachers to aid children in analyzing the core beliefs of civilized life in expanding the range of emotional experience and in developing those traits of character that mark us as enlightened human beings. Basic skill development is extremely important. But the mere fact that it is so easy to measure, relative to higher order outcomes, should not trap us into making basic skills the very reason for the existence of schools. If teachers are free to range more broadly across the spectrum of educational outcomes from basic skills and fundamental knowledge to emotional and character development, then we will have increased their possibilities and hopefully achieved a better alignment between what we seek and what we can obtain.

Second, when equality is made the governing criterion for educational decisions the schools may serve well as instruments of social improvement but perhaps less well as instruments of educational improvement. Notice the not so subtle distinction here between schooling and education. The mere fact that something goes on in schools does not mean that it is necessarily educative. Indeed much that takes place in schools can be miseducative. The proper aim, I believe, is to proceed with change on the basis of evidence which demonstrates that doing (X), or (Y), or (Z) will enhance the educative nature of schooling as well as contribute to the uplifting of society in the nation. To achieve this result we might more profitably consider what Thomas Green has called the "Criteria of Equity and Excellence" as governing criteria.

Finally, the possibilities and potentials for better rates between teaching and learning may be enlarged by more profound conceptions of curricular. The quickest way to make this point clear is to recall an incident from my childhood when I commended my father for being such as good salesman. He responded by saying, "Son, it's really pretty easy when you have a good product to sell." I have often wondered about the products we hand teachers with the admonition that they sell them to students. Are they the kinds of content or curricular that allow teachers to make use of the full range of their instructional potential? Do they permit teachers to fully engage the hearts and minds of students? Do they elicit from students the forms of response that add to the joy and satisfaction both teachers and students achieve from their work?

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I need to change my tape.

(Brief pause while reporter changes tape.)

COURT REPORTER: We're back on the record.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: My experience with schooling needs me to answer all three of these questions negatively. There is much that we can do with the matter of curriculum if we seek a better alignment between the possibilities of schooling and our desires for schooling.

Rather than summarize by paraphrasing what I have already said, I shall try to extend these remarks in a way that recalls points already made. The critical question in analyzing the current state of education is not what is wrong, who made the mistakes, or what will shake things up. It is, what are the current possibilities and potentials for schooling, given that society has constructed an elaborating -- elaborated schooling in the way it has and what is it that we desire from schooling. In coming to grips with these questions I believe we will make more headway more quickly by finding ways to restore and release the full potential of our knowledge about teaching and learning of the extraordinary personnel who staff our schools and of the learners who attend these schools. Might we please rethink our positions to accord to teaching the nobility that activity deserves and to learning the profundity and excitement that good teachers can bring to it when they are free and encouraged to do so.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, Gary.

Does someone have a question -- a quick question that they would like to ask Gary? He gave us a lot of things to ask questions about -- what do we desire from schools, does anyone want to start on that one? Where do we begin? Shall we keep that for the hour?

MR. FENSTERMACHER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: All right.

Jay Sommer?

MR. SOMMER: I would -- I would like you to explain a little bit more of what you have in mind about the curriculum. What's wrong with the present curriculum, if any?

MR. FENSTERMACHER: I could answer that in two different kinds of ways. One has to do with how we teach it, our instructional approach to the curriculum, and the other one is what that curriculum consists of. And to try to be brief, I believe that when we engage in what are called "goal reduction," we take very high level -- what I think we would call noble goals and we reduce them to measurable behavioral objectives and competencies, we're very much changes the nature of those goals. And it's also the range of topics that we cover. I think some topics have a -- make it easier to liberate the minds and hearts of learners than others do.

MR. SOMMER: What do you say to people who would say to you, our students don't know how to write down a sentence properly? And you mentioned the fact that you are not as preoccupied about basics as most everyone is. Am I correct in assuming that . . .

MR. FENSTERMACHER: Well, I believe they are very important. I guess I would say to them that the solution of a problem isn't devised by simply changing the order of words that you express the problem in. If children can't write, the way we approach that problem typically is to say, well, we need to teach more writing. We just take the same words that we express the problem in and we make the solution out of the same terms. And I would think that we could be more creative than that. That we could teach writing as a by-product or an epi-phenomenon of substantive learning and inquiry and not always as a subject in itself, though I don't want to deny that there are occasions when it should be taught directly as writing.

MR. SOMMER: So that you accept that ba -- basis, that this is a basic.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: Yes, yes.

MS. MARSTON: Ms. Kirk?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Margaret Marston.

MS. MARSTON: Gary, in your remarks you, I believe, stated that schools are -- are a reflection of social changes and concerns, and not always what we envision schools to be in our minds. And yet I did not hear your -- you and perhaps that was the way you wanted it, whether this was good or bad. Could you elaborate on this a little bit for me. My thinking is if schools are a reflection of social changes then what the public and educators are trying to do is indeed not being done. If I take the end of your remarks to mean that basic skills are -- are our important thrusts and we need more creativity. And yet schools are still a reflection of social change. I'm confused from that statement to this and could you expand on that a little bit?

MR. FENSTERMACHER: That's a good question and if you and I had -- if we had some more time to straighten that up. In 15 minutes . . .

MS. MARSTON: I know.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: . . . I ended up simplifying the context enormously. It was really more to get an orientation and -- and perspective. As far as if schools are reflections of social changes and social order, is that good or bad. I -- my temptation is to say it simply is and . . .

MS. MARSTON: Neither one -- a fact.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: . . . what -- what I wish to avoid is, if we can see that in large measures schools reflect the society they serve then it seems arrogant of that society to constantly castigate and blame those schools. And -- but it -- but it's important for society to hold a hope and aspiration for the improvement of those schools. So the approach it seems to me then is one of beginning to seek improvement in an environment of support, encouragement, and trust and not in an environment of criticism and negation.

MS. MARSTON: Un hunh, un hunh, thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Gary.

We do remember, however, that Gary Sykes said that adversity is the mother of invention perhaps.

Our next speaker will be David Imig.

David would you introduce yourself?

MR. IMIG: Madam Chairman and members of the Commission, I'm David Imig the Executive Director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Washington D.C. The Association is pleased to have this opportunity to appear before the National Commission on Excellence and Education and we appreciate your attention, particularly Ms. Kirk's attention, to teacher education which is so vitable -- vital to the well-being of today's children and those generations to come.

For the past 125 years the Association and it's predecessor organizations have represented the interests and concerns of higher education institutions and I bring with me that perspective today.

Joining me today, and we hope to be able to team, this is Dr. Anne Flowers, ACP President Elect, the Dean of the School of Education at Georgia Southern College.

Our comments today will focus on the theme identified by you as "The Achievement of Excellence in Teacher Education." Dr. Flowers will address the assumptions under good in-teacher education programs and describe programs as they occur in schools, colleges, and departments of education. I will point to some of the directions teacher educators are prepared to take and make some recommendations to the Commission about actions that we hope that you will recommend 11 months from now on your final report.

I think perhaps it is appropriate for me to begin by noting 5 conditions that I believe confront us. I would call these resource limitations, and while Gary Sykes in a sense dismissed these, I will come back to them in both this -- at this point and later. I think the -- at the present time schools of education are confronted with enormous resource problems. The ability of schools, colleges, and departments of education to respond to change are limited by these resource limitations.

The first and most important of these phenomena is the enrollment roller coaster of the past decade which has resulted in significant reductions in the size of schools of educations, faculties, and a pronounced decrease in the feelings of security among faculty.

The second characteristic is the well -- of resource limitation is the well documented decline in the quality of the applicant pool brought on by a variety of economic and social problems which has further eroded the status of campus base preparation programs and changed the basic level of -- at which instruction can be presented.

A third, and a point that Dr. Flowers will elaborate on, is the underfunding of teacher education programs.

A fourth resource limitation is the lack of adequate life space, or program space and the fact that only one-fourth of the professional program, and therefore quality control responsibilities, is under the immediate power of faculties of education.

And finally, that while significant changes in teacher quality could come from a variety of interventions in preparation programs, schools of education alone have almost no control over the political, social, and economic forces that are determining who or why to become teachers or the conditions they will face in the schools.

I would ask Dr. Flowers to -- to deal with the assumptions and then I'll come back to a set of recommendations.

DR. FLOWERS: Good morning, Ms. Kirk and Commission members, I'm Anne Flowers, Dean of the School of Education at Georgia Southern College and President Elect of the American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education. I'm pleased to have an opportunity to be here with you today and to be able to share some of my thoughts.

Briefly, I would like to outline for you what makes up a teacher education program. Let me begin by reviewing some of the basic assumptions directing the education profession.

First; education and, therefore, teachers insure that this nation's citizens reach their highest potential intellectually, socially, morally, economically, and physically. Teacher educators teach teachers who in turn endow children and youth with the goals and ideals that will shape future societies. To ignore or neglect the roll of teacher educators in this dynamic cycle of events is to ignore or neglect the welfare of society itself.

Second; teacher education is the preparation and research arm of the teaching profession.

Third; like other professional programs the teacher preparation program is most effective when it is located on a campus of a significant college or university where it can have the advantages of a scholarly environment.

Fourth; the process of educating persons to be teachers transforms lay citizens into professional educators. The difference between an educated person and a professional teacher is pedagogy, the science of teaching.

Fifth; teacher educators and their schools and colleges of education exemplify what they teach. Since teaching entails at least two types of performance, interaction with students and manipulating subject matter, a typical program for the initial preparation of teachers includes several components. I woulld like to list those for you.

First; a strong foundation of liberal arts studies which expose students to the various academic disciplines making up the school curriculum. The humanities, languages, sciences, mathematics, social sciences, and the arts. The contents of this component are usually stated by the college and the university as graduation requirements and are not determined by teacher educators.

Second; studies in the social and behavioral sciences, psychology, human growth and development, anthropology, sociology, and their application to the practice of education.

Third; a specialization component which provides a strong indepth study of a teaching field or fields, specific knowledge and skills to be acquired usually are defined by colleges and university major requirements. The requirements, however, should allow time in the teaching major to accommodate the preparation for teaching particularly at the secondary school level.

Fourth; a component providing generic pedagogical knowledge and skills in assessing, diagnosing and interpreting student learning needs, planning and prescribing instruction, conducting or implementing instruction, evaluating instructional outcomes, managing student conduct, demonstrating human relation skills, using conferral or referral skills, and incorporating knowledge and skills relating to population specific characteristics.

Fifth; specific pedagogical knowledge and skills for teaching specific subjects for specific age or grade levels.

Sixth; Clinical and practicum experiences which bridge theory and practice. This component includes observation and analysis of classroom teaching, laboratory and clinical experiences, practicum and student teaching, and an internship. It is not assumed that clinical and practicum experiences will be concentrated into only one culminating experience near the end of the preparation program. It is assumed that such experiences will be provided throughout the preparation program at appropriate times beginning with observation and analysis and leading to full responsibility for classroom teaching under the supervision of qualified personnel.

Recently a well-known university president recommended that education students should spend at least half of their program in general studies. The president was sadly misinformed. Students preparing to teach already spend more time studying liberal arts, language, literature, humanities, mathemathics, natural and social sciences than they do in teacher education. Typically, professional study comprises only 41% of an elementary school teacher's program and only 25% for that of the secondary school teacher. This constraint on time devoted to professional studies during a 4 year program has presented considerable difficulties. While there has been an explosion of knowledge in the last 30 years areas of teaching and learning there has been a corresponding decline in the amount of time in which teachers can be prepared to utilize it.

As one solution to the problem of insufficient preparation time, some schools of education have implemented preparation programs in which 5 years rather than 4 are required for students to obtain a Bachelor's Degree. Our association recognizes this extended program's concept as one way to respond to the program of inadequately prepared teachers.

In another effort to improve teacher quality, practitioner involvement in teacher education is on the increase. During the last decade there has been a significant growth in the clinical experiences segment of teacher preparation as measured in both academic credit hours and clock hours. Joyce and his colleague showed an increase of 4 credit hours and 50 clock hours since 1963, and concluded that this change increases the opportunities for academic concepts to be applied to real school situations. Significantly, hindering improvements in teacher education programs is an inadequate base of support. Funding for teacher education programs within an institution is often based on weighted student credit hours. This weighting can result in inequities since schools, colleges, and departments of education are expected to conduct an extensive array of outreach, or service programs for school districts which typically do not generate credit hours and, therefore, do not qualify toward university allocations.

Certain states have recognized this constraint and topped up, or freed a certain percentage of funds for schools of education to conduct workshops, seminars, or assessment activities for the local school agencies. At the same time complexity formers have determined that the preparation of teachers is less complex than, for the example, the preparation of a nurse, or a veterinarian.

Husso and Orr recently completed a study in 1980 which concluded that more is spend educating a typical third grader, about $1400.00, than preparing a teacher, $927.00. At the same time according to these same researchers within the university the average expenditure for equivalent full-time student is $2363.00. The fact is that teacher education is a revenue producing program which explains in part why it is offered by so many institutions of higher education.

As recently as 1977 teacher education generated 11% of all university student credit hour production and in return received less than 3% of the institution's programmatic resources. While a one to one allotment of dollars to academic programs for dollars generated by those programs may not be tenable, a better balance must be achieved between various productivity measures and the budgets for teacher education.

I hope this brief overview will be helpful to you and provide you some background of some of the problems and conflicts that are facing teacher education today.

And I thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, Dave Imig and Anne Flowers, for your excellent presentation.

Do we have questions? I'm sure we do.

MS. MARSTON: Yes, I do.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Margaret?

MS. MARSTON: For both of you. Dr. Imig you stated that the schools of education really have no control over the entire course offerings or the quality of the course offerings for the younsters who are going to become teachers.

MR. IMIG: The -- the assertion would be that schools of education have little control over the total range of courses and programs. They obviously do control those courses that are found within the purview of the school or the Department of Education.

MS. MARSTON: Pedagogy and all that.

Do you feel that with more control from your schools of education you would produce a better product? If yes, how would you go about that?

MR. IMIG: Well, the assertion would be that schools of education need greater control over the courses and the -- the total range of programs across the university. Control in the sense that a negotiated exchange of involvement and activity in resources with the total institutions.

MS. MARSTON: And you're speaking of quality?

MR. IMIG: Quality.

MS. MARSTON: Correct.

Ms. Flowers if I may ask you a question please. Very interesting statistics that you have provided for us on the costs, what would you do with more money in the schools of education with that improved quality?

MS. FLOWERS: We probably could do something about that control if we had a little more money. And we would be able to bring in the quality kind of experiences for our students, whether it would be through instructional materials and methodologies, whether it be bringing roots together and specialists to help us design those programs.

MS. MARSTON: For more practicum experience, for more quality indepth courses in learning; what types of things are you thinking of?

MS. FLOWERS: I'm thinking really more of planning and evaluation kinds of things, in feeding that evaluation back into the program itself and calling on additional expertise that would be available.

MS. MARSTON: I see. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: David, did you have something that you wanted to say?

MR. IMIG: I think that right now we're on the threshold of some significant changes within schools of education. I think that Gary and Gary and their colleagues in a sense in the research community have brought us to a point where there is a knowledge base that we have not heretofore been able to tap. And I think increased resources and the infusion of those -- of new concepts and new ideas into programs is going to drastically upgrade the quality of the program. I think that we're right at that point where we need those kinds of additional interventions and would be prepared to draw upon that kind of talent and the research findings that they have provided. Right now you are caught in a situation where there is not adequate time or space to accomplish everything that's expected, not dissimilar from the dilemma that Gary was talking to a minute ago.

MS. MARSTON: Yes, yes. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Jay Sommer, one short question.

MR. SOMMER: David, there are some critics of the universities for teacher preparation who say that the proliferation of courses is so enormous and that it's almost there for the accommodation of the professors individuality rather than a contribution to general educational excellence in preparation for the teachers. What do you say to those critics?

MR. IMIG: Jay, I'm afraid that I agree to some extent with those -- with those statements. But again, I think that we are at a point in which there are going to be some dramatic changes in the way that courses are designed and presented within the universities. I think the idea of an individual professor having total control over his or her own course is just at the point of being transformed into a time when teaming is going to come together. The computer technology, the new technology that's out there, is going to demand that more and more people be involved in the overall total design of the program, so that I think that the individual professor's prerogatives are going to be somewhat diffused over the next few years.

MR. SOMMER: But you acknowledge that that as a task it -- it does exist?

MR. IMIG: It does exist in . . .

MR. SOMMER: That charge is proper?

MR. IMIG: . . . some institutions.

MS. FLOWERS: Let me add to that a little bit in another question that was raised here. As we were talking about some of these cooperative endeavors, we have very little control at this time as if we're preparing the history teacher, for instance, of what courses they will be teaching as they get out in the school. We're responding really to a major and maybe a professor's interest in a particular area in what he may teach. The teacher may not ever come in contact with that. There may need to be a special curriculum for teachers addressed to what they need to teach young people rather than their specialties that they had at the doctorate level that they enjoyed doing the research in . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Good point . . .

MS. FLOWERS: . . . and I think that's what we're striving for.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: . . . good point. Very good point. Thank you very much.

I think we will go on now to Barbara Peterson.

Barbara do you want to stay there or do you want to use the podium?

MS. PETERSON: What would be best, use this mike?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: That's fine if you're comfortable there.

MS. PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.

Good morning. It is an honor and a pleasure to be with you this morning. And I'm really excited about being involved on this pursuit for Excellence in Education.

Insuring the teachers for children is one of today's greatest challenges. Laymen and educators regard the teacher as the most significant factor in determining the quality of experience that a child will have in school. It is indeed important that we evaluate and improve upon our teacher training programs. I was asked to share with you today four areas which hopefully will help us in taking a closer look at teacher education programs.

First; what did I expect to happen when I began my teaching career and what really did happen? How did my teacher training program prepare me? How could it have prepared me better for the profession that I chose, and my recommendations for training programs for future teachers.

Let's look first at expectations versus realities. What really did happen? As I prepared for my first year of teaching, I designed a classroom which I thought would provide a program that would allow children to work in different levels at different activities and for different periods of time. And I just knew that when those children walked into my classroom the learning process would begin. What happened? I discovered that I hadn't provided for all that I needed to. I had provided for intellectual differences, but there was so much more that I needed to be aware of and to be looking at. Their personalities were not the same. They came from so many different backgrounds and family life situations. Their preschool experiences, they differed tremendously intellectually but socially and emotionally as well.

I also chose teaching because of my love of children, and I thought that when I went out to teaching that would be one of the most important things. And I found out that it was important. That you did have to have a love for children to be out there working with them. However, I realized that love was not all you needed. You also needed to enjoy working with them. As a teacher I had to be patient and understanding, and a understanding of what is important and why it is important. I knew before I began teaching because I had teachers in my family that it would take a lot of energy, and time, and effort, and I was right on target. I didn't miss on that one. I thought that I would have plenty of supplies and equipment and anything that I needed by just asking. I found out my first year that was not the case. I did expect to keep records on children. I knew I would be observing them to learn how they -- they would learn and move and grow, and to be able to select materials and plan activities that would help them learn.

What I didn't realize is all the other paperwork that was involved in teaching; filling out forms, attendance cards, et cetera. I also felt that everyone would love it as much as I did and that everyone would be as excited about what I was doing as I was. There were a few exceptions along the way. I also found many teachers willing to help, to give me an extra hand and to show me the ropes. I felt that I was really lucky and fortunate in that respect. I also realized after I began teaching that the school alone cannot assume the total responsibility for educating the child. Parents, the community, and teachers need to become a team. They need to communicate and on a regular basis. They need to be provided, for their children and themselves, with meaningful basis for developing and learning.

My teacher preparation program, I felt was strong. I want to share with you today some of the strong points that were part of my program 15 to 16 years ago. That seems like a long time. And when I had to go back and look at those kinds of things, it was a challenge for me. I was exposed to all curriculum areas. Not only in the academic areas but the find arts and the physical education. These areas helped me in giving me a greater understanding of what children needed to know. A vital part of my program was the child growth and development. This enabled me to have a greater undestanding of how maturation compliments the learning process. The nature of the learning process was stressed, as were methods, and they helped me in pulling all of these areas together. Several classroom experiences were provided. Those experiences helped me in feeling more secure with the children that someday I would have in my own classroom.

There are two major points of how my teacher preparation could have prepared me better. First of all, I needed many more experiences with children. It should have began my freshman year at college. And I also needed a greater understanding of how to interrelate subject areas. As Gary talked earlier about the writing, that's one of the problems with teaching separate subject areas. We don't realize that we can teach writing in math, or you can teach writing with science and social studies. It needs to interrelate with each other. My recommendations then will begin with that area. Even though my basic training included all curriculum areas, this was -- this is not the case in all universities. In many cases they are electives and they need to be required courses. They need to be in all areas; fine arts, physical education, and academics as well. As I recommend this area it also is important about interrelating these subject areas and showing teachers the way to do this. These additional credit hours may mean going to four and a half and five year programs. And I was pleased to hear Anne mention that they had looked at things -- at programs which said we may need to make our program and training sessions longer. But I propose this question to you. If it requires seven or more years to become a doctor, is slightly half that time, over half that time, adequate time, to prepare a teacher.

The second recommendation would be, that students who have made a decision about becoming teachers early in their college program need to have many varied experiences with children. These should begin with their freshman year and continue through their college training. It is also important to prepare our future teachers to become aware of the available resources which can help them when they become part of the school system. Student teachers need to be placed with master teachers. What better way to prepare them than to have excellent models.

The many pressures that are a part of each child as he grows into today's world creates a need to better prepare our teachers in the social science areas. The teachers need to consider the effects upon the child in such factors as family relationships, social patterns, working mothers, age of siblings, regional influences, experimental levels, not to mention the attitudes and values the parents have displayed in raising this child.

And my final recommendation; there has been a great influence and emphasis placed on mainstreaming children into the regular classrooms. I feel very close to this because yesterday was my final day of my course on exceptional children at the University of South Carolina. That needs to be part of our teacher preparation program. We should include training for teachers to be able to work with these children.

There is a tremendous responsibility placed on our teachers today. And before I began my little boy in kindergarten, someone shared a poem with me that, at that time, I appreciated a great deal as a parent, but it has become very meaningful to me and significant as a teacher. And as I share this with you, I'd like you to consider that these are things that we need to be preparing teachers for. And It's called:

TAKE MY SON BY THE HAND

My son starts to school tomorrow,
It's all going to be strange and
new for him for awhile.
And I wish you would sort of treat
him gently.
You see, up 'til now he's been king
of the roost.
He's been boss of the backyard.
And I've always been around to repair his wounds.
And I've always been handy to soothe
his feelings.
But now, things are going to be different.
This morning he's going to walk down
the front steps, wave his hand, and
start on his great adventure that will

probably include wars, and tragedies,
and sorrows.
To live his life in this world
he has to live in will require
faith, and love, and courage.
So teacher, I wish you would
sort of take him by his young
hand and teach him the things
he has to know.
Teach him, but gently if you
can.
He will have to learn, I know,
That all men are not just,
That all men are not true.
Teach him that for every scoundrel there is a hero.
That for every crooked politician
there is a dedicated leader.
Teach him that for every enemy
there is a friend.
Let him learn early that the
bullies are the easiest ones
to lick.
Teach him the wonders of books.
Give him quiet times to ponder

the eternal mysteries of birds
in the sky, bees in the sun, and
pluck flowers on a green hill.
Teach him that it is far more
honorable to teach and to work
than to cheat.
Teach him to have faith in his
own ideas even if everyone else
tells him that he is wrong.
Try to give my son the strength
not to follow the crowd when
everyone else is getting on the
band wagon.
Teach him to listen to everyone
and only filter out the things
that are true.
Teach him to sell his brawns and
brains to the highest bidder but
never put a price tag on his
heart and soul.
Teach him to close his ears to a
howling mob and to stand and fight
if he thinks he's right.
Teach him gently but don't coddle
him because only the test of fire

makes fine steel.

This is a big order, teacher, but

see what you can do;

He's such a nice fellow, my son.

I'd just like to close by saying it is a big order, a tremendous responsibility that is placed upon the schools and their teachers for these young people are the hope of the future.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

MS. LARSEN: Barbara, are you a one or a two session kindergarten teacher?

MS. PETERSON: Two session.

MS. LARSEN: Thank you.

MS. PETERSON: Thirty children each session.

MS. LARSEN: How much break between the two?

MS. PETERSON: I have an -- an hour. I have an 8:30 to 11:00 session and a 12:00 to 2:30. And usually by the time the children get out and come in you have about 30 minutes.

MS. MARSTON: Barbara, in your teacher training program were you given enough preparation in looking -- and you mentioned exceptionalities and you've just finished a course in it . . .

MS. PETERSON: Right.

MS. MARSTON: We have found, of course, that remediation in the kindergarten, first, second, and third grades, solve lots of problems and certainly you would be the first to pick up exceptionalities of one sort or another or problems and make some sort of a recommendation or diagnosis to the first grade. Do you feel that your training was adequate in those areas?

MS. PETERSON: No, it was not. And that is why my purpose in going back now in working with exceptional children . . .

MS. MARSTON: And that you did on your own, not at the advise of anyone?

MS. PETERSON: Right. My district did support it. Our district was encouraging their teachers to improve in that area, but it was of my own choice.

MS. MARSTON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Barbara, I think we have a lot of questions but we'll wait until the later discussion period.

MS. PETERSON: Okay, fine.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We would like to hear from Robert Scanlon now please.

MR. SCANLON: I have to sympathize with Barbara in teaching kindergarten because I tried that once in my life. And I want you to know the first time I got hell from a supervisor was teaching kindergarten in Pittsburgh, Barbara, Barbara, because I couldn't figure out how to get 30 snowsuits on kids and get them on the bus at lunchtime at the same time, so I put them on a recess and just left them.

MS. PETERSON: For the rest of the day.

MR. SCANLON: Good morning, my name is Bob Scalon and I'm the Chief State School Officer from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I'm delighted to have the opportunity to appear before this Commission and particularly pleased that the members of the Commission have stated their intent to emphasize rigor, excellence, and raising of standards in education.

My remarks are based on a new report drafted by the Council of Chief State School Officers Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Accreditation. I have been serving as Chairperson of this Committee since August of 1980 when Ann Campbell, a member of your Commission then the Chief of the Chief State School Officers, appointed a Committee of Wilson Ryals of California, Lynn Simons of Wyoming, Wayne Tigg of Alabama, Greg Andre, who was then the Chief State Officer in Massachusetts, and me. She had the foresight to insure that the Chief State School Officers would be ready to help individual Chief State leadership initiative in this area and respond to groups like this when asked for data on state policies on teacher education. And the Board, the Chief State School Officer's Board asked us for data on state policies on teacher education and asked us to consider the influence of -- on quality teachers and teaching in several factors including the factor of recruitment and selection procedures; the increase, social and legal demands on teacher performance; compentency based teacher education; certification standards; accreditation; length of employment; levels of compensation; and so on. More generally, the Committee set out to develop an indeapth analysis of the most critical issues and to recommend appropriate state level action including proposed policy statements, strategies, procedures, and even legislation.

It was agreed that the first activity of the Committee would be to survey the 50 Chief State School Officers to document current state policies effecting the qualities of teachers in teaching. The questionnaire was designed by my staff in the Department of Education in Pennsylvania. I thought it was unique in it's form and approach because it stated alternative policy options and then asked Chief -- Chief State School Officers to state whether the policy is currently in effect in their state, whether or not they favor it regardless of whether or not it is in effect, whether they expect a change in this policy by 1985, what they see as the most desirable policy on the issue, and what events might facilitate or deter the adoption of the desired policy.

Questionnaires were mailed to all of the 50 Chief State School Officers during the summer of 1981, and then an analysis was completed in March of '82. So my testimony today is based on the recommendations made in the Ad Hoc Committee Report on this survey which is scheduled for adoption by the entire council of Chief State School Officers later this summer.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I need to change my tape.

(Brief pause while reporter changes tapes.)

COURT REPORTER: We're back on the record.

MR. SCANLON: In presenting the findings of the Committee survey, I want to lay out for you two distinct chains -- chains of logic which lead to specific recommendations. Now the first focus on the certification of individual teachers, and the second deals with teacher trainee programs at colleges and universities.

Each chain of logic has seven steps. The first is based on the premise that the real problem we're facing is not that teachers aren't being trained well enough. In fact as I travel and visit schools, and I've been in over 3000 classrooms in the last three years, the teachers that I meet for the most part are dedicated, talented, bright and creative. The problem is our next generation of teachers for the 1980's and beyond. The real problem is our inability to attract talented people into teaching careers. American teachers have never been drawn from that segment of students with the greatest academic ability.

Since the 1920's research studies have shown that those who enter teaching score less well on measures of academy ability than other college students. Lately, however, the problem has grown more acute. In 1977 college seniors majoring in education ranked 14th of 16th college specialties on mea -- of measures of verbal skills, 15th on tests of mathematical knowledge, average verbal SAT scores of education majors entering declined from 418 to 389 between 1972 and 1981. In mathematics scores fell from 449 to 418. Both declines are steeper than the average 20 point drop found in other subject areas. In the SAT scores of the 1980 senior education majors are 48 points below the national average in mathematics and 35 points below in verbal skills.

Ernie Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching and former U. S. Commissioner of Education calls it a national emergency in teaching. Rewards are few, morale is low, and the best teachers are bailing out and the supply of good recruits is drying up. Now the absent of incentives to attract talented people into teaching helps to explain our mixed survey finding on the degree of changes in state policies on teacher education.

While many Chief State School Officers are now moving their states toward compentency testing and other innovations, a sizable group is staying with current policies, planning no change in certification, procedures, or requirements, or standands. Few of these status quo supporters are resisting change because they are satisfied with the caliber of teachers they're producing. Instead, they seem skeptical about the potential of competency testing or other state controlled mechanisms for having any real impact on the quality of teaching.

Some Chief State School Officers feel that minimum grade point averages and other standards do nothing to address economic and societal problems such as, the salary is too low to attract the brighter students. They point out that it is only natural that salaries in the bottom one-third of the economy attract students in the bottom one-third of the college going population. And some of the survey responses touched on potential incentives for attracting able college students into teaching such as, scholarships, quaranteed summer jobs in business and industry for teachers. More structured career paths for teachers and higher state funding for education primarily for teacher salaries. But all of these discussions implied that such changes were not really a matter for state policy initiatives. Chief State School Officers are, apparently, are setting the minimum competency standards as the major feasible initiative.

Now the majority of states are not involved in major studies in that redesigning aspects so their teacher education rules. The setting of minimum competency standards is the most frequent innovation. In some states minimum scores on tests of basic skills like SAT's are being used. In others, tests of professional knowledge about teaching are being developed. And what I want to emphasize, however, is that the way the cutoff scores are generally being determined on either kind of test. At the present time minimum scores are generally set by individual institutions of higher education or by state government authorities. If colleges and universities set the cutoffs, they usually choose ones that will optimize their enrollment in teacher preparation programs. If state authorities set them they usually choose one that represents the consensus of a variety of interest groups such as, teachers' unions and groups representing colleges of teacher education. Now, whether cut -- whether cutoff scores are set by consensus or for maintenance of an optimal number of certification candidates, they are not generally set on the basis of some rational view of how adaquate a prospective teacher's skills should be. Minimum standards for basic skills should be used -- should be based on cutoff scores that represent standards of excellence expected of prospective teachers, not by consensus or for maintenance of teacher supply.

How well should a prospective high school teacher do an SAT? As well as the average college bound high school student, perhaps. At a recent NIE Symposium it was pointed out that if students who score below the medium on tests like SAT were denied admission to teacher education, 70 to 75% of all teachers would be excluded. The simpliest understanding of supply and demand suggest that shortages caused by such drastic reduction in the number of low achieving students who enter the pool of prospective teachers will ultimately lead to higher salaries and better working conditions that are needed to attract higher quality teachers into the profession.

Many of the Chief State School Officers express the fervent hope that their State Legislators will allocate increased moneys for larger teacher salaries with the aim of attracting more competent teachers. It seems clear, however, that the State Legislators are unlikely to do so without some urgent demand such as the current shortage in science and math teachers. Perhaps a more general shortage will result if we drastically cut the supply of available teachers by refusing to certify a good member whose communication and computation skills do not even match those of the average college bound senior, or high school senior. If the minimum basic skill standards were set as standards of excellence rather than by political consensus resulting shortages of certified teachers should lead to higher salaries and other incentives that attract able students. These shortages could be caused merely by insisting that prospective teachers must be able to read and compute as well as the average college bound high school senior. This argument holds without even addressing the controversy of whether -- over whether we can actually develop a valid test of professional teaching skills.

In general, the only time the Chief State School Officers have mentioned teacher shortages in their survey responses was to express concern about the possible detrimental effect of minimum competency standards. They are clearly concerned about the political repercussions of such shortages. How then can they recommend a policy of setting standards high enough to cause shortages. Chief State School Officers can increase their ability to plan for and respond effectively for teacher shortages by raising minimum competency standard it seems to me, in cooperation with neighboring states. Such cooperation, cooperative initiatives of policy changes would reduce the political pressures on a single chief acting alone, increase the credibility of the proposed policy change, and reduce the probability that the new standards would cause a flow of college students into colleges in neighboring states where it's easier to obtain certification. In fact, the feasibility of cooperation between neighboring states and the changing of teacher education standards is supported by our survey finding of apparent consensus among states in the same region of the country. Neighboring states appear not only to be moving in the same direction, they even seem to be at similar points in their consideration in adoption of new teacher education policies.

It's worth adding a seventh step to this chain of logic in order to help stop a trend that appears to be developing across the country. Now several states are considering the discontinuance of provision of emergency certificates that enable persons who have not graduated from approved teacher education programs to teach. This change is being proposed in the name of stricter standards and it is widely supported by teacher associations and associations of colleges and teacher education.

There is a good reason, however, to reconsider this particular policy change. Emergency certificates offer safety mechanisms that could keep the shortage from becoming a disaster so that states should retain their emergency certificate provision. With some emergency certifi -- certification to serve as the mechanism, the solution to shortages then becomes a willingness of school boards to raise teacher salaries and offer other incentives to attract bright competent individuals away from other jobs to fill vacant teaching positions. Ultimately, though, salaries will recon -- rekindle interest in teaching in the brightest college students and enrollment in teacher education programs will start to grow. And with these results as the aim, teacher associations and associations of colleges of teacher education may withdraw their opposition to a teacher certification.

Let me -- let me review for you the second issue that I suggested earlier. Because the main argument so far focuses upon the use of more stringent selection criteria to reduce the supply of teachers and create a demand great enough to raise teachers' salaries while at the same time increasing the number of academically able students attracted into a teaching career. Now those Chief State School Officers who have taken policy initiatives in this area have concentrated on selection criteria rather than recruitment efforts. And they have mentioned ideas like scholarship programs, more differentive career paths for teachers, and mid-career internships for teachers with business and industry. But none have really implemented major efforts to recruit able individuals with these and other similar efforts.

If we turn our attention to recruitment incentives which have been neglected while the focus was -- has been on selection criteria, it seems to me we should seek support in state legislatives for such innovations as loan forgiveness programs for able students who commit themselves to a given numbers of years teaching in the state and now reluctantly

I'm talking about money. But I've dwelled on such recommendations as raising standards by cri -- criterial excellence rather than concensus, interstate cooperation in raising standards, the causing of teacher shortages, and the impact on teacher salaries, and the importance of emergency certificates because I know this Commission is interested in practical recommendations that can be carried out without additional money. And I have hope that I have communicated to the extent to which states are willing to assume leadership responsibility in implementing these recommendations. Yet to succeed there will be two kinds of financial help needed. Groups of states willing to form partnership and significantly raise standards for entrance into teaching will need money for development of appropriate tests and financial aid will be needed to encourage able students to enter teacher training programs.

Please note, however, that these purposes can be achieved without new money. Funding for educational research can be targeted for test development and exist -- existing financial aid funds can be targeted for students going into teaching. Talk about more buying for the buck, well this last suggestion will enable federal officials to address the quality of teaching in elementary and secondary schools with the same dollars that are now labeled, quote, "Support for higher education".

Now I would like to briefly lay out for you a second chain of logic. Our survey results reveal a trend in state standards for approval of teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities that is a bit disturbing in the context of the first chain of logic. In the best of all possible worlds, of course, we would have a perfectly valid test of professional teaching competencies. We could use it to screen prospective teachers for certification and we would not even need such things as a program approval since a successful program would simply be one that gives individual college students the skills to do well on that test. The state of the art of competency testing is no where near this point of course. So we -- we try to find out, we must try to find out what features of teacher trainee programs are related to producing effective teachers. Then we can require those programs that have these features before they can be approved as teacher preparation programs.

In an effort to make program approval standards more stringent many states are moving in the direction of increased requirements on schools or departments of education and their faculties. Some are requiring faculty members to hold valid teaching certificates and to work in the basic schools on a full-time basis at regular intervals. Some require faculty members to submit individual professional development plans for approval to local committees of elementary and secondary school teachers and administrators. And there are many variations on this theme all based on the rationale that prospective teachers should be trained by college faculties who have an up to date, realistic, first hand knowledge of the life of the classroom. Unfortunately, the survey data reveals another trend. Many high quality small private colleges are eliminating their teacher training programs altogether, and on those campuses where the programs are retra -- retained the prestige of the faculty of education score department is diminishing rapidly . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Dr. Scanlon, I think the time has gone over . . .

MR. SCANLON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We'd like to hear the rest of what you have to say. We also realize that you're going to be leaving soon this morning, so I think probably what we would like to do is just have you summarize maybe in your own words. And then we would like to ask you some questions now.

MR. SCANLON: Let me point out to you that we provided for the Commission members the -- a copy of the actual survey that was completed. And you will find in that survey an appendix of the policies that are stated in all 50 states in terms of the general activities that are occurring in teacher training institutions greatly.

The sun belt states are the only innovators in America in teacher education and that to a large extent is done for a number of reasons based on this survey. You'll find a number of the middle states; Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, for example, are working together. At the same point in time they are more concerned about concensus within the association before they move forward. Many of the states are just sitting and waiting.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Dr. Scanlon.

MS. LARSEN: Dr. Scalon, I look forward to reviewing all your documentation, but I would like to ask you if the deliberation that the Chiefs had with your recognition that we will have emergency situation as far as sufficient teachers. Did you approach creative innovative ideas as far as the change in technology and perhaps changing the structure of the classroom to use master teachers on television and other creative innovations as that type . . .

MR. SCANLON: Not really. The focus was, to a large extent, on the current practices of the research policies that we know about and the suggestions the Chiefs would make concerning whether they were adopting that. But it did not deal with technology or new methods of delivering teaching.

MS. LARSEN: Do you feel that there is a potential in that area?

MR. SCANLON: Well, there is certainly a potential in teaching in elementary and secondary schools in America, and with that potential being real it is obvious that we have to do something about the folks that are going to teach.

MS. LARSEN: Thank you.

MS. MARSTON: Would you like to share with us why the sun belt states in your view have been so innovative in their approaches to teacher certification?

MR. SCANLON: I believe one of the reasons and one of the real surprise findings of the survey was the regional nature that the sun belt states created for themselves initially. That is they found that it was easier early on to work as a consortium of states to remove some of the needed professional changes from the obvious political arena that some of the decisions that need to be made soon find themselves. And I think regionalization was one of -- one of the ways in which that occurred and there was sure no relationship between supply and demand in those particular cases. Or if you looked at some of the data from specific states, Florida is a growing state but an aging state in a sense as opposed to so many other changes, there was no real clear data except the regionalization.

MS. MARSTON: And which states do you call the sun belt states?

MR. SCANLON: Well, it really extended from Florida across the south; Georgia, Alabama, included . . .

MS. MARSTON: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California . . .

MR. SCANLON: . . . it does include . . .

MS. MARSTON: . . . all that . . .

MR. SCANLON: . . . except California.

MS. MARSTON: Thank you.

MR. FOSTER: Dr. Scalon, do I understand that some of those sun belt states or one of more of them have already begun to implement raising the minimum standards?

MR. SCANLON: Now most of them have and they have attacked the problems altogether. They have taken a look at the four or five major issues, looked at entrance requirements, exit requirements, competency testing. Do it all at once. Many of the other states are trying to do it piecemeal. One little thing at a time. But sun belt states seem to do it altogether.

MR. FOSTER: They're implementing it . . .

MR. SCANLON: They're implementing it.

MR. FOSTER: . . . they are not just discussing it?

MR. SCANLON: They're implementing it. That's correct.

MR. FOSTER: Will that be covered -- will your survey cover that in some detail?

MR. SCANLON: Yes, it does for every state.

MR. FOSTER: Fine.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Emeral Crosby and then Jay Sommer.

MR. CROSBY: You had mentioned perhaps getting several states together to be involved in establishing some criteria of excellence for the teacher preparation, and I heard earlier from Gary in our first presentation that we got about 15,000 districts and we're looking at teaching and schools as being probably much more political than any of the other professionals. If you got 15,000 districts you got 15,000 plus board members that every two or three years are there for election. You have state officers who are also involved in the election process who will promise whatever in order to get electives as well as the legislatures. What are some of your recommendations in terms of getting states together in order to establish this criteria?

MR. SCANLON: The State Board Chairmans of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have orchestrated such meetings at their request and the states are now establishing a series of regular sessions to began to review what each of the states are doing and why, what the implications are. That leadership is coming in our cases from the State Boards of Education in those three states. Some states have formal and you'll hear a little later I believe about a formal mechanism that already exists in the southern regional consortium that's going on in this part of the world.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Do any of the presenters have a question for Dr. Scalon because he will be leaving? He won't be here for the discussion period after the break.

All right, Jay.

MR. SOMMER: You cited a very alarming percentage and I read that somewhere else. How many teachers would fail at tests that a high school senior couldn't pass? And I am wondering, at the time when we are trying to uplift teacher morale and also to placate, perhaps, the public that things are not as bad as they seem to be, whether it's fair to publish this kind of data without making the point that I'm a language teacher and four years after I started algebra and geometry I shortly forget it. And I'm wondering how many engineers remembered foreign language after they studied it. And how many doctors remembered algebra when they entered their profession. And I think that this is perhaps a very important point to consider. What are some of the things that we publish that can be very, very harmful? I -- of course it goes without saying that an elementary school teacher teaching a variety of subjects should be prepared for that. But a high school teacher, although it's nice to have a well rounded person, it's perfectly normal for them to forget many of those subjects, and while the student, as a senior, is involved he could do better, of course.

MR. SCANLON: Well, I think it's a -- to answer your question as specifically as I can, I think we have to constantly put in the context over 120 years of training teachers that teachers have rarely scored as well or as high as some of the other colleges on college campuses. But our general public does make judgments on numbers. On SAT scores, for example, for entering freshman. And as the data -- the data suggests from the NIE study that if the average SAT score for any college or university was applied to a school of education for entrance into that school about 70% of our folks in that school couldn't get in if that were the standard that was used. And that's a real -- I think that ought to be a concern to the profession. In Pennsylvania's case we have 86 schools of education in Pennsylvania. We last -- 10 years ago we graduated 18,000 teachers, last year 8,000. Of those 8,000 teachers -- and by the way if the standard was applied to our schools it would fit the same mold. Of those 8,000 teachers about 40% found employment in teaching, or chose to find employment in teaching, so that we could probably have trained 4,000 of higher quality people and met the same market demands.

MS. MARSTON: Have any of those 86 schools closed because of the significant drop in the number of teachers coming out of it?

MR. SCANLON: No.

MS. MARSTON: All right. Is your State Board -- are you considering such pressures?

MR. SCANLON: No, we're trying to find ways to -- we find in our small liberal arts schools that the higher quality students tend to enter those schools, and we're trying to find ways to encourage those schools of education to remain open because there is talk on those campuses about closing them.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: All right our last question will come from Gary Sykes.

MR. SYKES: Well, I wanted to make a comment to what Jay was saying. I think the concern for mean drop overlooks the variation and my sense of the data is that the drop hasn't come because schools of education have lowered their standards and are taking weaker students. There is no, to very meager, evidence that that has occurred. On the other hand when you break out, by people entering, the scores across the spectrum what you find is overtime. The drop has occurred in -- in the highest scoring people going into teaching. It's at the upper level that we're losing people and that's what bringing the average down. So the phenomenon is that we're no longer getting the brightest that are going in rather than that we're dropping our standards. That the floor is dropping and we're taking a poorer quality; it's that we're losing it at the top, not the bottom. That's the problem and that tends to get obscured when you simply cite the averages. How do you get -- the problems isn't -- isn't simply how to screen out the worse, it's how to attract the best and you need a different set of policies for that. Minimum competency test won't address that problem. That isn't to argue against them but that's the wrong solution to the problem of attracting the best. What's happening in particular is, the best and brightest women who use to go into teaching are no longer doing so. They're going into engineering, law, medicine, and business and that's -- and that's -- what Dave was pointing out the same is true of minorities. Education for decades has enjoyed a hidden subsidy, blocked career mobility for women and minorities in our society.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Gary. I might mention that it might be a trend that we will see reversed in a few years because once women review all of these things and discover that they can do these things they may decide that they are really happier teaching.

At any rate we have two more speakers today, and at this point I would like to ask Eva Galumbos.

MS. GALUMBOS: My name is Eva Galumbos and I'm the Staff Director to the Task Force on higher education in the schools that was appointed by Governor Graham when he was

Chairman of the Southern Regional Education Board. This Task Force deliberated for a period of 6 months and issued it's report, "The Need For Quality", which I think each of you has received. This report was published last June and has continued to receive a great deal of attention in our Southern Region and I think in other parts of the country. And my comments today will come largely from this report and perhaps from some of things that have occurred since the report was issued. And I will limit myself to those sections of the report that have to do with teachers.

This Task Force bridges the two sectors of K-12 and higher education. Governor Graham felt, and other members of our Southern State Legislatures, and the Governors felt that it was extremely important that if we're going to make any improvements towards quality in education we had to bridge the gap for lack of communication between the two sectors of eduacation and, therefore, this Task Force is composed of the very constituencies on both sides of this educational issue.

About half of the report deals with selection and preparation of teachers and certification of teachers. It is true that the southern states have been innovators in improving the methods for selecting teachers. The whole idea of testing of teachers, of testing into college, of education programs, of performance evaluation for beginning teachers, has had it's momentum here in the Southern Region. And I

6

think what is particularly interesting is that this momentum has occurred at a time when the Southern Region is realizing already the scarcity of teachers. We are a little worried. We are running scared, I have to tell you frankly. Because here we are promoting these things that will further reduce our supply of teachers at the very time when we in this part of the country are already, in some of our states, experiencing teacher shortages. So our window of time to get this done is very, very short. And the pressures are going to be on us to retreat if we're not careful.

Let me explain a little bit about the selection procedures that are occurring in the South and the recommendations of the Task Force on these selection procedures. As an underlying assumption we concur wholeheartedly with the emphasis that Dr. Scalon has given us that it doesn't make any difference on what you're going to do to improve the selection as long as teacher salaries are where they are we are going to have a very hard time attracting better people, and that that's the bottom line. However, we don't think our legislators are going to do anything about a general increase in teacher's salaries, that is really a monumental increase, until they see something done about the quality of the teachers. So the two subjects go hand-in-hand and have to be dealt with jointly.

Now, on the testing situation. None of us in the

Task Force or no one I think in any of the states that have taken -- made the decisions to move on in testing of teachers has any kind of illusion that a test is going to measure how well that teacher will perform in the classroom in terms of teaching style. All it does is to test content. But you cannot teach what you do not know and, therefore, the states determine that we -- we would move ahead to test what teachers do know in the areas that they are suppose to teach the children. And that that at least would be determined before they would move on to provisional certification.

This does not answer in any way the problem of then measuring how well the teacher performs in the classroom. You might have a person that tests very low that performs well in teaching style. He may not know any content but can sure keep those kids disciplined. On the other hand, you may have somebody that has all the content but nobody is paying any attention in the classroom. No one has developed any test that we know of yet, a paper and pencil test, that will measure the teaching style. So we don't have any illusions about that, but we feel that there is a basic minimum of content that a person should know. We do think that it's a lot fairer to a young person that's going into the col -- into the teaching profession to determine whether that minimum content base is there at the sophomore year rather than to wait until the senior year and have a person graduate from the College of Education, from the college as a whole, then take the test and find out, well, I don't have any content knowledge and, therefore, I can't pass this minimum test. So our recommendation is, go ahead and develop content tests, but it's better to do it earlier than late. It should be as an entrance into the College of Education.

And of course at that point the illness is clearly upon the first two years of college, the general education component. And if you will look at most of the teacher education tests that are being used, it's general education component that measures basic communications and mathematic skills. I wouldn't include algebra. I wouldn't go so far. Some of our newspaper people who have taken these tests in various states will tell you that they are minimal tests. They do not require you to recall what you might have learned as a senior in second and third year algebra. So the Arts and Science Department is to be held accountable, isn't it, for the first two years of college. That is not the College of Education. And by putting the education -- by putting the test at the end of the sophomore level it will put the focus again on the accountability of where it is that these young people may not have gotton what they need to have in the way of content. We're not terrible sanguine about the idea of admission of criteria that are based on grade point averages. We think grade point averages into the Colleges of Education are very fundable. You have the pressure for enrollments and different institutions have different grade point averages so we do see our states moving in the direction of admission tests at the sophomore level. Several of our states are using the ACT because that is the test that is being used for admission into the college anyway. Some other states are using the SAT. Some states are developing their own tests.

And that leads me to the next subject, "The Development of State Tests". There is a recommendation in the Task Force Report that urges the states to get together regionally to decide what they want to do about tests rather than to reinvent the wheel in every state by developing new tests. The tests are very expensive to develop. We have several states that have moved on ahead and developed their own tests at the end of the four years of college rather than using the National Teacher Examination. We also have some states now that have mandated the development of their own tests for the first -- for entrance into the College of Education.

The Task Force recommendations, one does two things. One is, if it's a basic common general education level that you're measuring with these tests, which for the most case it is, is that so different from state to state? Why do we need to reinvent that wheel in every state.

Secondly, where do we have any norms that we can measure as to where we are doing if we develop our own tests. Is it a way of hiding again from the public. And at that point I would like to comment to you the fact that Mississippi, which is always the state that we point to as being at the very bottom, has decided that they will stick with the NTE. And even though their cutoff point is at a very low percentile when you -- after the four years of college, they are willing to have them viewed in that manner rather than to develop some other tests where you would then not be able to know what percentile they were at.

We also think that if we're going to have a movement of teachers from state to state, which I hope we will encourage, because if we are going to have a scarcity of teachers we will need to have the move from state to state. That developing yet another barrier with a new test when you have already taken another test in some other state doesn't make sense and, therefore, we need to move toward interstate reciprocity on these tests rather than developing new and more tests.

That pretty much covers what I was going to say about testing except I would like to reemphasize, I think I'm in complete agreement with the testimony from the Chief School Officers, the tests are not going to guarantee quality. The tests are only going to eliminate the very bottom that, you know, absolutely does not have general skills, basic common skills. Now that's something that's more than we did without the tests, but it is no guarantee of quality. Now knowing that that's no guarantee of quality, the next thing that we want to -- the next section of our report deals with strengthening teacher education programs. And we are cognizant that in our 14 southern states we have 350 colleges that are engaged in preparing beginning teachers. There was a great deal of discussion as to whether the fact that we had so many colleges engaged in teacher education contributed to quality or did not contribute to quality. The consensus was that if we're going to have a teacher shortage we need to have teacher education programs as dispersed as possible, to be accessible to the young people to enter into teacher education so that they may commute to these colleges perhaps, rather than just a few colleges that have these.

North Carolina is a state that embarked upon -- and this was done by the university system, not by the State Department of Education although the two of them are now joining together to do this jointly. North Carolina embarked upon an evaluation of every teacher education program within their state. They too, have this tremendous proliferation of programs. What they have done is not to eliminate teacher education from any single campus, but to reduce the number of specialties that were being offered in some of these campuses where you might just have two or three people in one particular specialty. And it was felt that there was no need to have this variety of specialties all over the state, but that you would keep the accessibility by having some type of teacher education program accessible in every institution in the state. And the last time we counted they had reduced 76 programs. They had cut out 76 programs out of the public institutions. By programs I mean specialties in this case. No college of educational department was eliminated.

The Task Force is very concerned that we have too many different groups evaluating teacher education programs. We have the State Departments of Education which are taking this job more and more seriously. At one time it was a rather perfunctory function to go and approve the teacher education programs. But the states are really, I think, becoming more serious about this. Now you have the state higher education agencies, the coordinating boards, who are also feeling the breath of hot air upon them. Now what are you going to do about improving teacher education programs? So here you have them, then out, all taking a look at their teacher education programs. And to say nothing of the fact that you also have NCATE and of course you have SACS, so we have all these groups that are coming and looking upon teacher education. And the recommendation is, for goodness sake get all these groups together and do something jointly; include productivity, the standards, the accreditation standards. They count numbers of books, not how many books are checked out. Look over those standards, make sure that those standards measure something worthwhile, and get in there and do this job together instead of having everybody go in there and do it separately

I want to say just a few words about certification of teachers, because I don't think you can talk about the prepar -- I'm sorry, I've got to back up.

There is one thing about strenghtening teacher education that the Task Force felt very strongly about. They recognized that every time that you ask a teacher about what was the best and the most valuable portion of their professional education component they will say it was the student teaching, but I wish that I'd had more and I wish I'd had more supervision. The methods courses, the foundations courses, that's not what they tell you as being valuable. It was the practicum, the internship. Whatever you want to call it. However, they will tell you that there is not enough supervision by college faculty of what's happening out there. They're sent out there on their own unless they have a good master teacher. If they are lucky enough to have a good master teacher. Do you know that we are paying these master teachers here in Georgia for this task -- $50.00. Now how can we attract good master teachers to do more supervision and feedback of these young people as they are entering the classroom in their student teaching experience and their practicums. We need to do more to reward, and this is a way also of recognizing merit of outstanding teachers, outstanding master teachers, who are out there -- who could be recognized and said, "you are doing something superb, we would like you to help teach the next young teacher and this is a reward." But $50.00 is no reward for that. It's an insult, some teachers will tell you. So the Southern Regional Education Task Force does seek to strengthen the student teaching experience and to improve the supervision and the feedback for these young student teachers.

Now on certification. I'm just going to read the certification rather than talk to you about it because I don't think I could say it as well as it's written.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Your time is up actually, so perhaps it would be better if you just summarized it.

MS. GALUMBOS: Okay. On certification the recommendations deal with allowing -- the state should modify their certification regulations and remove rigid and unnecessary requirements. Revision should identify and assign specific responsibilities for certification by both the state and the educational institution. Revision should also include provisional certification for all beginning teachers including arts and science graduates for secondary school positions until the performance of all beginning teachers have been evaluated. Performance weaknesses and content, or in methods areas identified during provisional certification, should be addressed before regular certification is granted. Such remediation if needed should include relevant additional courses, or staff development activity, and the effects of revised certification should be evaluated on a regional basis.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. I think your testimony has been very exciting and very controversial and there are lots of questions. I think we are going to hear our last speaker, have the break, and then come back and began.

MS. GALUMBOS: Could I mention one thing. We have with us today a member of our Task Force, Dr. John Davis, who is here in the audience. Dr. Davis is Superintendent of the Virginia School System and I wanted to be sure . . .

MS. MARSTON: He's our boss.

MS. GALUMBOS: . . . that -- he is our one Task Force member here today.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

MS. MARSTON: Welcome, Jack.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I need to change my tape.

(Brief pause while reporter changes tape.)

COURT REPORTER: We're back on the record.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

Our last speaker, which you may take the podium, is Ralph Torlington.

MR. TORLINGTON: Thank you, I'm Ralph Torlington, Commissioner of Education from the state of Florida. I'd like to use the podium . . .

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, sir.

(Brief pause to correct malfunction in tape.)

COURT REPORTER: We're on the record.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Maybe you'd better identify yourself again in case . . .

MR. TORLINGTON: I'm Ralph Torlington, Commissioner of Education for the state of Florida.

A number of things I think have been covered this morning and actually I'm very pleased with the testimony that I've heard this morning. My prepared remarks, I'm going to diverge from them. I'd like to commend them to you and to perhaps cover some of the outline that -- that we have.

First I'd like to say we have a common corps program which began several years ago when we got the teacher's profession in Florida to agree on a minimum standard of essential competencies for teachers and the competencies included basic communications, communications and computation skills, and generic testing of competency. My paper reviews about our preparing methods to the prospective teacher which

I will focus in on in my informal remarks as I go on.

A beginning teacher of where our legislature has just recently adjourned and we are embarking on a program, a new program, for help for the beginning teacher, most particular during the first year. Then our program is dealing with the recognition for and reward for competent teachers and the problems in dealing with efficient or incompetent teachers who might be presently involved in the school system. And then reference to the section of management, particularly focusing in on the high performing principle and then some general conclusions.

I want to make some comments in reference to -- however, to particularly the question of teacher preparation, and that question about where are -- get our teachers, and particularly some of the things we are doing that I believe have been brought out well, in part, by the panel here this morning. Earlier this morning we had a statement that our problem isn't how to screen out the worst, but is how to attract the best. And I think all of us can agree on that. But the point I would like to emphasis to is that those two are interelated. If you want to attract the best, I don't care whether it's dealing with teaching, or wherever else it might be, you are out there looking to attracting young men and women, you're going to want to have an activity, a profession, or status, or an appeal that causes that individual to feel that they are going to have a worthwhile contribution to society, and I think that element of idealism should always be involved in anyone that plans to go into education. If we have a situation in which we perceive that those that go into education are really sort of on the low end of the totem pole are persons that are not particularly worthy. A person could go into that because maybe they want to cut it somewhere else. You are never going to be a winner then as far as attracting the best. And if you are going to have a profession and you're going -- and you're going to be having into that profession an absence of standards we are not going to be in the business of being able to hold and to attract the best. Any profession needs to be out there working to raise it's standards, raise it's -- it's attitude about how it feels about the disservice that it's rendering to it's clients and that this is a question of our going ahead and, in effect, of licensing, and I guess I can express it that way, persons who are, indeed, not reasonably qualified and are perceived and acknowledged by many not to be reasonably qualified, is a real loser for us in terms of our being able to attract persons who are worthy to the profession of teaching.

Now there is a key point. I'm a very strong addict of the idea of having testing programs for persons entering professions. Notice that I used the -- I used the plural.

We have not done that in teaching, and I frankly am here to say that it is a winner for us in terms of elevating teaching and in terms of helping us to carry out what we are about. We're in the student learning business, and if we're going to have effectiveness in terms of student learning we've got to have good teachers and we've got to have sound management.

And if -- let's look at the situation in which we find ourselves. Dr. Scanlon from Pennsylvania points out that he has 86 programs of teacher education in the state of Pennsylvania. I believe we have some 26 in Florida. There are over 1300 in this country. We have -- and these are accredited programs and so we speak about how can anyone possibly police that situation. How can you take a credential and say here is a person who has a diploma from an accredited institution and that is all we are going to look at. We accept that as face value when we know perfectly well that there are literally hundreds and thousands of persons who move through accredited institutions who are not capable to meet minimum standards. And that is something that, I think, works an adverse situation as far as the capable and the outstanding persons which enter teaching. If you've got somebody else getting the same credential that you have, the same recognition that you have, and that individual isn't meeting even reasonable minimum standards, that is not going to cause you to want to continue, or want to move into that type of program or profession. I think there is a lot in terms of testing program besides just the question of just the screening itself. I've come to realize that more in the last several years. And in terms of just the element of credibility, a whole lot of whether a teacher will be satisfied -- and that's a lot of what we're talking about -- I could answer it if we could just -- Ms. Peterson, as I've heard her speak here this morning, all we need is another million like her, you know, and we'd have it made.

The question about getting, and attracting, and holding the most -- the best people and as I mentioned in here, I hope that the best people are those who score the highest on test scores. But I do know this, that you're not going to have somebody able to carry on a job in teaching, like a profession in teaching, that isn't able to reach some reasonable minimum standards in terms of our -- of our basic skills of communication of math, of writing, and things of that sort. That is essential -- is essential for us to be successful. So there is no way, when we began looking at our testing situations as far as Florida was concerned, we looked there. We accept credentials from over 1300 programs. We can't police those. And you can do all you want to in terms about saying, well, the credentials from each school should be accepted because it's on that list. But if you don't have something in the way of a test to check on beyond that, you're making a very severe mistake. Now, I learned that some years ago. I was -- I'm a very young person, and I was in the Florida legislature beginning in 1950. Some three years later we did something that would perhaps seem a little absurd. We had accredited law schools in Florida and because they were Florida's schools and they were accredited, we realized that we did not need to give the Bar Examination to persons who passed Florida law schools. We only needed to give the Bar Examination to persons that came from Harvard University, or Michagan or other questionable institutions. Now, then someone said, well, you know, I don't -- maybe that's not necessarily so. And so the law was changed and then we said everybody will have to take the Bar Examination. And do you know what happened? It was the best thing that ever happened as far as law education, legal education, is concerned in Florida.

If you want to know what I think will be happening in terms of our testing program, it is going to relate itself in the most effective way in terms of raising what happens in our colleges and universities. And I'm not talking cally about colleges of education because people that are in the College of Education do fairly point out, that the teachers that we get really are coming from many places, coming from Liberal Arts Colleges, they are coming from all over. And our testing results show that you can go through any of those places and they can be accredited, and you'll still come out with some persons that simply are not ready to be licensed, to be certified, and not to be admitted into the profession of teaching. And if we raise -- and a test is something of an outside evaluator. And for those that say they don't like accountability, I can tell you that if you're got 1300 custo -- 1300 institutions out there and you don't use some kind of a measure on that that, in effect, audits that process, and I will admit it's an imperfect audit, then you're making a great mistake.

I think that the testing program that we've just began in Florida, we've been in operation now for a little over a year, is having a profound and will have a profound effect on the quality of our institutions of higher learning. And I think it will effect or impact on what's happening in the rest of the country as well. Now you are a national panel, and I'm here to say that I think that nationally we need to come to the recognition of what we did in Florida on that law school situation. Just because something is accredited is no reason that we should accept that diploma, that work, at it's face value. There should be some element over and beyond that that persons are expected to meet, and I don't know any way to do that other than through some form of a test and evaluation of the students. That's our -- that's at least a part of our game plan.

I know that the time is limited. We have -- I gave you the outline of what it is we're doing. I think we're -- we feel very, very good about the results that we expect to get from our programs. I'll close with, you know, you can go out now and you talk to a person. I can go to a high school, or I can go to a junior high school, or talk to someone else about, you know, you ought to be a teacher. And let's talk about really what's been happening as far as persons entering into teaching and talk about, we want to attract the best. To do that we've got to have that element there of the young men and women of saying, "You know, that's something good to be in." And we've been kind of bad-mouthing ourselves into an educational depression. It's time for us to get -- turn it the other way and recognize how critical it is that we be successful. And we can't be successful unless we have people that are -- enter into education that are good top flight people, who are committed people who like to relate, as Ms. Peterson does, in terms of educational -- educational service. I don't know of anything that's any better than that.

Now, we looked -- I've met with one of our teacher groups the other day and I asked them, I said, you know, we -- I remember we had some programs called "Future Teachers of America." How many of those do we have in Florida? And I fumbled around a little bit and I said, "Well, not very many, about ten?" And I think they were flattering me because they felt that I would know something like that and would give them the answer. And the next question came in about, name one. Name one, and I don't know of a single one in Florida. Now you go back and you look where you come from. I don't know how many that you can name. We, in effect, have given, you know, we've sort of given up that situation. Now we've got to be in the situation of telling persons that, yes, we want you to get into something that is the most important thing that really the Government and the others that are involved with in this country that is critical to our future. And this is something that is worthwhile. This is something that is professional. This is something in which we are going to be -- in which we expect persons of high work and high quality to enter, and it is something that can be very satisfying or in your life. And this is a profession, this is an activity that you ought to consider. We haven't really been doing that and that's an important part of it. But we can't do that unless we're ready to enforce standards and you cannot enforce standards if you simply sit there and say, is a school accredited and if a school is accredited we're going to honor that certificate, or whatever it is that that school does anyway. We're going to have to do to the same -- the same thing as far as the teaching profession as we did in the Flor -- to the Florida Bar when we said we're going to give that examination to everybody regardless of whether they went to the University of Florida, whether they went to Berkeley, or whether they went to Chicago, or Harvard, or Podunck. And I think that that from a national standpoint, that type of assertion on your part can be one of the most meaningful things that could come about. People will support us if they know that we've got the commitment and we're ready to go. But I will tell you this. There isn't any taxpaper out there that is going to support an education system that they think is a loser and isn't committed to getting the job done.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Mr. Torlington.

I think we will take questions later.

Two bits of business here. If you are interested in testifying this afternoon, please, this is your last chance to fill out an index card at the registration table during our coffee break. And remember that the record for a written testimony from organizations and individuals remains open until June 12th.

At this time we will take a 10 minute break and then back to discussion.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken.)

COURT REPORTER: We're on the record.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We will have approximately 45 minutes of discussion.

I would like you all to notice that that's Ted Freeman walking up the aisle. He's the Regional Representative for Secretary Bell. We're very happy to have him here. His office has been very gracious to us.

Now, the discussion period is about to began, questions and answers. We will try to keep them relatively brief, within our time limit and give everyone a chance to speak. Who would like to began?

MR. CROSBY: I've heard several comments this morning in terms of 1300 or maybe 1300 plus institutions that through the accreditation process accredit teachers, and I know that generally, as a people, we as a nation, one of our expertise is to identify problems from that point on that may deteriorate. But I'm wondering for the people who are in the College of Education are the ones who are listening, that probably the problem is these 1300 institutions. Are you recommending that we have some kind of national agency that will monitor and control these 1300 institutions as they certify teachers. And I guess I'm asking it to three or four people.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Who'd like to take that question, David Emit? All right, David.

MR. IMIG: Ralph was the one who made that statement. There are 1341 schools, colleges, or Departments of Education in the United States at the present time. There --

I'm not sure that Ralph was recommending it, but I would like to call attention to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Bill Gardner, who is one of your consultants, is the current Chair of the Council. NCATE, as we know it, is a collaborative organization made up of representatives from schools of education and from the practitioner community that accredits approximately 538 of that 1341 institutions. Now, NCATE would say that those 538 produce approximately 85% of the new teachers that come out every year. So we do have in place a national accreditation body, but the body itself needs to be strengthened. And one of the things that Dr. Gardner is about during this year of his chair in collaboration with both AECT and NEA is to find ways to achieve that strengthening of that entity.

MR. CROSBY: But you're not recommending another kind of agency other than the volunteer agency of this organization?

MR. IMIG: We would not. I'm not sure Ralph or Bob Scalon would not be calling for something.

MR. FOSTER: That's the first -- first time I've heard that figure, that they -- they accredit a 500 . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: . . . and 38.

MR. FOSTER: And the remainder?

MR. IMIG: The remainder would be accredited by regional accrediting bodies, or through a state program approval. However, even withing that 1341 there are some institutions that are not accredited by any regional or national body.

MR. FOSTER: Have they tried to be or . . .

MR. IMIG: Some of those have tried to be, some of those are at early stages of development, some of them have been denied.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: And it doesn't matter . . .

MR. IMIG: That's a very small number, that's less than 10% of that -- of that total.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Excuse me. It doesn't matter to the states then whether or not -- what is the feeling on the state's part if they have any . . .

MR. IMIG: Some states look very carefully and critically at the NCATE status for it's institutions. Other states have put in the place their own alternative systems.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Yvonne Larsen.

MS. LARSEN: I believe it was Eva Galumbos who spoke to the fact that there was a money situation that would bring us quality teachers, and we weren't going to get the money from legislatures, et cetera, until we could prove that our product was going to be better. But I will ask any of you that might wish to respond. Representing the public, the public's perception of public education is that there are some good teachers and there are some not so good teachers.

We know as school board members and as school districts that there has always been great pressure from the K-12 systems. That everyone who has worked the same number of years, has the same representative type of degrees, gets the same amount of money. Higher education has had the differentials. Do you see and are you in support of if, in reality, we did go into more of a merit system which those of us who have collective bargaining it would be rather difficult to do. But would this resolve some of our problems if teachers could be graded by their peers as is done in a higher educational area. And I think the public would be more willing to see good teachers rewarded. Anyone who would like to answer that or speak to that controversial issue I made?

MS. GALUMBOS: I'd like to respond to that. This was an issue that was considered by the Task Force and as you will note the recommendations are silent on that point. They don't say yea or nay. But since the recommendations came out and we took the recommendations to our Legislative Advisory Council, which is made up of legislators from the 14 southern states on the education committees, this was the first question they asked of us. We cannot afford at this point in our financial stringency to have substantial, across the board increases. Couldn't we go the route of merit increases. And we threw the question back at them and we said, "You're elected to make the difficult decisions, it's in your lap."

So I'm just giving you the history of what occurred in our situation. Now we have surveyed in the region to find out who is using merit pay and it's very spotty. Very few systems are using merit pay. There's not too much evaluation as to how effective the merit pay has been. I think it tends to hinge on the kind of evaluation system that you might have in place to make the determination of who really deserves the merit pay. There's that tremendous fear that it will be abused and that there will be favoritism, and until you can get around that and have some standards that will apply equally to everybody. Now, I would recommend that you look at the Houston system which I gather you already have . . .

MS. LARSEN: We -- we were there.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We were there.

MS. LARSEN: Yes, they give extra stipends for a variety of issues.

Do any of the others of you have any feelings on the matter, or are most of you somewhat that it should stay status quo?

Jerry -- Gary.

MR. SYKES: My sense is that there is a distinction between so called merit pay systems and incentive pay. And that Houston has instituted an incentive based system against some categories that are fairly easy to implement, such as absenteeism, where there is an indicator that -- that's pretty direct or teaching in particular schools you get -- you get a salary increment. Merit pay typically means trying to tie added increments of pay to some kinds of indicators of effectiveness that can be uniquely attributed to the action of a particular teacher. And my sense is, that from -- from the little bit I know of evaluations of merit pay schemes, both inside and outside of education, that they tend not to work very well by -- by that definition. That they tend to founder on the technical difficulties and the information costs of setting up such systems that try and tie pay increments to performance indicators uniquely attributable to individual teachers. It's -- it's that last that's particularly difficult because there are so many sources that influence how much learning goes on over any period of time, for any particular child, that to try and tie particular gains to the actions of particular teachers in order to award them pay makes for a very difficult technical problem. And as any good economist will tell you, information costs. To get that kind of information requires typically a very cumbersome, difficult system and if you try and forgo that problem by using a nomination system; principals, other teachers, and so on. Then you're squarely faced with the problem favoritism, and games playing, and so on.

The other kind of evidence, I think, relates to some historical incidences where they tried to tie pay to performance. It was done in England in the 1800's. And the other problem with those systems tends to be that it's not very difficult to cheat. Who's -- who's going to check to make sure that paper and pencil tests aren't doctored. Who's going to check to make sure that low achieving students aren't simply left out of the testing so that the scores will rise if you make sure you test all the low achieving students at point one, but you don't test them at point two, and hence you get an average score increase. What I'm saying is, when you try and erect a system to account for all those kinds of problems you very quickly get into massive technical problems. So this is something of a personal opinion that is grounded on some research. Merit pay strickly conceived, I think, is an idea whose time has not come and I don't think it will ever come in education. It doesn't even do very well in lines of work where outcome indicators are much clearer. But I do think that incentive pay a la Houston is a very different matter. And there are ways to provide financial and other rewards to teachers for excellence that are different from merit pay.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you.

Jay.

MR. SOMMER: I'd like to address my question principally to Eva Galumbos, but I hope that other people will have something to say about that. After 25 years of teaching, I have the feeling that the pencil and paper tests that we -- that are a possibility would not measure, in my opinion, the effectiveness of a teacher. Perhaps 30% would be valid of that test. What kinds of provisions are being made to see that some oral examinations are planned for as they are in industry. Interview types of things where you are going to find out, in my opinion, a lot more than what is written down on a piece of paper because that could be forged -- what's written on a piece of paper. But if you were to observe a teacher in a classroom and what he can perform, and examine the teacher orally in an interview situation, what they have to say, I think are very strong indicators. I wonder what provisions have been made in the particular tests that you're making up, and what your opinions are in general about that.

MS. GALUMBOS: Well, I'd like to clarify that we are not making up any tests at SRAB. We are encouraging states to use tests. The tests are content oriented to measure the subject that the teacher will teach. The other recommendation that deals with evaluating the performance of the teacher which cannot be measured by paper and pencil tests. I agree with you 100 percent. That is the provisional certification route. That beginning teachers are not put on some kind of a continuing certificate, but that they are put on a provisional certificate. Now Georgia has gone the route, I think, of a three year provisional certificate, and Georgia has developed a very elaborate system of examining the performance of this beginning teacher through observation by trained observers twice a year. Lesson plans that are prepared, how those are executed. Interviews are included. All of this is very structured and it has been developed at a great cost. And it cost money to keep it going. Florida, I'm sure Dr. Torlington will talk about what's happening in Florida with the internship, and Dr. Davis can mention that the same thing is happening now in Virginia. There will be performance evaluation of all beginning teachers. South Carolina is going that route. I would caution the Commission that I think that we really need to evaluate this performance evaluation, these interviews, the competencies that we are measuring. We could be in danger of developing another huge maze of bureaucractic procedures because certification started off as a quality control measure. And I don't think any of us think now, that looking at all these separate courses that you're suppose to complete in order to be certified, guarantee anything as quality. So I hope that we don't think that the provisional certification will be a panacea. These systems are only as good as -- as they are administered I think.

MR. CROSBY: This is probably not a question, but if you can make it into a question I would appreciate it.

I'm -- I'm from Detroit and the automotive industry has given us some other kinds of things to start thinking about. Not only in terms of the automobile but even in terms of the Union. And I'm just wondering if the public is going to wait on us to make that decision before it makes a decision in terms of the selection of better people. The automotive industry did not listen to the people when they were asking for certain kinds of cars. Consequently, Japan made the cars and the public bought them because the public wanted certain kinds of cars. Now I heard you mention that the legislature in not willing to pay additional money because it doesn't see certain kinds of things out there. I don't think that the public is going to wait for it's kids to be educated while the legislature of someone else is out there trying to make some kind of decision, as to whether or not the tests, or the College of Education and everything else, is going to be involved with certain kinds of quality. I think they have already determined what kind of quality. Now we maybe end up getting a foreign import to come in to teach our kids which may not be Japanese, but it may be the very people that you're saying that's not passing the test because they may send them some place else.

But anyway, are there other kind of pressure groups out there now, other that is really moving toward trying to upgrade our education even if we have to bypass whatever the standards may be for certification. I don't know whether I said anything or not . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: You've said a lot.

MR. CROSBY: But is there?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Where to began with that question. Who would like to answer that?

MR. TORLINGTON: I think we've got a key idea that I believe is working and that it's success will accelerate. And that is student outcomes. After all what business are we in? We're in the student learning business. We're really not in the teacher certification business. Why do we worry with teacher certification? Well, presumably, because it will have an effect upon student outcomes. So if you're looking in terms of what your output or your -- what's going to happen as far as what it is that you're ultimately suppose to be doing, that is the way to go. Now then, I find that legislatures in the public, they are ready to buy whatever they think they are going to get a result. If they don't think there's going to be a result there, it won't make any difference. You can go there, beg as hard as you can, and no one will help you if they don't think that you're going to be a winner and going to be successful. Our strategy in Florida, and then again it remains to be seen, but we adopted a goal saying that we would be in the upper cortile of states within a five year period in educational achievement using commonly accepted criteria. Then we said that we would pay our teachers in the upper cortile of states and that we would move that on the installment basis. So when you move out -- why we say, here is a gap between where we are now and the upper cortile in terms of instructional pay in the country, and that we're going to seek to close that gap one-fifth of the way each year for five years. In the meantime, we're working to bring our achievement up to where we can say, on an overall basis, using commonly accepted criteria, that we're in the upper cortile of educational achievement in the United States. Now you say -- I'll tell you about what commonly accepted criteria are, but you limited my time.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

Margaret.

MR. CROSBY: May I just . . .

MS. MARSTON: Oh, yes . . .

MR. CROSBY: I'm sorry.

MS. MARSTON: Go ahead, please, Emeral.

MR. CROSBY: I'm just wondering and we may be getting some other testimony this afternoon, and Barbara, I don't know how you fit into this one, but I mentioned the automotive industry. The Unions have always thought that we will never give up anything. We're going for more, and more, and more. I -- we even had in the states saying that we will not give concessions on taxes until finally we found out that the industry was moving some place else and all of a sudden we're giving concessions on taxes to keep the industry there. The UAW has given in onto some concessions because either you don't work and somebody else works, or we get some robots to do it or what have you. What is happening, or can you speak to that, if not, you know, in terms of the association, or the federation, or what's the other group?

MS. LARSEN: We have some speakers this afternoon in that area . . .

MR. CROSBY: Oh, if that puts it -- puts it in a bind, I'm wait until this afternoon.

MS. PETERSON: I'm -- I'm still not sure what you're asking?

MR. CROSBY: What -- what are these groups doing in order to provide us with -- to improve the performance or the preservice or inservice education for teachers?

MS. PETERSON: These outside influences, the community -- when you talk about the automotive being in the Unions or the Unions for the teachers . . .

MR. CROSBY: Right, right, right . . .

MS. PETERSON: . . . you're talking about the Unions for teachers. There are some tremendous moves in that area that, in some ways, I've seen teachers backing off from it. Some teachers have backed off because they don't want to be with the Union. The stigmatizing that goes along with that, they have lots of concern. I know within my own school district. When I moved to South Carolina I thought being professional you joined your associations. I felt that was my responsibility as a teacher. And when I moved into my district I found that was not the case with a lot of people. And we started doing some studies about why, what was happening, why are they backing off. And part of it was because of this unionism that was happening. They are out there doing some tremendous things, and I've been involved in our local and state association and, of course, support the national. And they're trying to help teachers and they are making some positive steps. It doesn't seem to be fast enough, you know, we need more of it. I don't think just one area can do it all. They are making some positive steps but it's not enough.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I think David Imig wants to address that question.

MR. IMIG: I think that we have addressed this in a way that we have -- our -- in a sense assuming that it's going to take outside interventions to change the profession. And I think that Dr. Scalon and Dr. Torlington and -- either have addressed how various groups are bringing pressures to bear upon schools of education on the profession. And I want -- I would want to make sure that before we leave here that the panel understands that there is a lot of movement within the profession. I think any ANAFT have taken the leadership role in the last few years and can seriously address the questions of professional quality. They are dealing with these. I think the NEA's profile in excellence is -- the description of the beginning teacher which is about to emerge out of the Representative Assembly this summer is an indication that that group is very concerned about the profession about teacher education and teacher training.

I also want to say that the schools of education are where there are a number of very significant changes taking place right now. Anne in her testimony talked about extended programs. Those came from within schools of educations. They came from leaders within the profession. This afternoon you are going to have a chance to hear a description of the University of South Florida. That happened as a result of internal decisions and the leadership within those institutions. We're not sitting back and waiting for the interventions. And I guess the assertion would be that often times those interventions get in the way of the changes that we're trying to create or promote wihin -- within the profession. We do need the help of outside agencies but sometimes that help, it comes in different ways and different forms.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, David.

There seems to be some discussion among the colleges themselves, however, in disagreement and so, in other words, the established organization such as yours have to agree first before you can even begin and that seems to be a big problem among the Unions too. Perhaps as Barbara said, this reform within the institutions comes to late. Perhaps you can speed that up for us. Perhaps we can help speed that up by urging the corporation and the dialogue, not only began, but continue intensely now, so that we can get on with this cooperation that Gary Sykes mentioned at the beginning of our hearing today.

Margaret, did you have a question?

MS. MARSTON: Yes, I have three and I don't have to do them all at one time. And I think the first question I would like to ask of the panel, if I may. In addressing teacher salaries, could you give me some indication of the states that have gone to a statewide salary base? And if, in those states that have gone to a minimum statewide salary base, the quality of education that the public perceives has improved? And have you been able to attract more teachers into the profession?

MS. GALUMBOS: Well, I'll give it a shot. Georgia has been on a statewide salary base for years.

MS. FLOWERS: Tell what the base is.

MS. GALUMBOS: Hmm?

MS. FLOWERS: Don't forget to tell what the base is.

MS. GALUMBOS: The base is somewhere around 13,000. And that's about the same as it is in most of our southern states now except maybe Florida is a little bit higher and I think Louisanna, with the oil money, has been able to go a little higher in the incentives that they have been able to put there. So I don't know whether the state wideness of the scale has anything to do with it because we've had that in Georgia for years. You've had that in Florida for years. I think it's the level and the level isn't really that tremendous.

MS. FLOWERS: You know a part of that ties with that low level and, of course, that doesn't attract many people, your bright people that we're talking about. Most of them can go out for more money to began with than that kind of thing. I think that's a consideration, but tied closely with that is whose accountable for teacher education. And you have a very hard time of letting the profession be accountable as we continue to certify provisionally people. How many people in this country are certified provisionally? How many are teaching out of field? At least one state has recently said that an elementary teacher certified in elementary school could teach remedial subjects in high school and be considered teaching in field. That teacher could teach remedial mathematics in high school with one course in math. The institutions did not and would not support a movement of that sort. So I think the job is to be done inside of the profession if it's going to be done at all well.

MR. FOSTER: You -- you talked about the $13,000 base in answer to Margaret's question. Is that -- that's the entry level?

MS. GALUMBOS: Entry level with a Baccalaureate Degree.

MR. FOSTER: And what is the maximum level that somebody could aspire to?

MS. GALUMBOS: I wish I had those figures at my fingertips, and I'm sure there must be some people here in the room that might be able to answer that but I did want to pursue that. I think that that's one of the problems. After all, if you're a liberal arts graduate and you come out of college, there aren't a whole lot of places in this day and age that you're going to make a whole lot more than $13,000 a year as a liberal arts graduate. I think we tend to forget that. Now we look at some of these surveys that come back from graduates, you know, how much are you making in your first jobs. And the teachers are not doing any worse in it than the liberal arts graduates. Now, of course, they're not doing as well as engineering graduates, as computer science graduates, as -- as the professions in great demand. They're doing quite as well as, say, somebody who's going into social work, somebody who's going into journalism. The trouble is they can't see a good way to rise up in order to stay in the profession because the salary stops and, you know, if you can't make a living on it to raise a family and send kids to college. That -- it doesn't go high enough. It stops after 15 years and there's a level at the top and you can't get beyond that except to get out of teaching.

MS. PETERSON: I'd like to give a real practical point of view from it. The money has never been a question with me, and I use to get teased because I wouldn't know what I was making, and they would say, "Go check at your district." And that was before I became a single parent, and I had a husband that had an income coming in. And I do believe that is a problem in education. That for many people it is a second salary and you've probably heard this before. So there wasn't the need for higher pay because it was a second salary coming into the family. But when you become a single parent you realize you can't survive on it and that does become a problem. We are losing so many good men because they just can't afford to stay in it. Men that are good with children and young people. And we're losing a lot of single parent people that have families and just really can't afford to stay in it. So there is where it comes down, just a practical aspect of how much you can make, I guess, when you're in the profession. I know it needs to be addressed, and if you talk to people that are out in the field a lot will say that's it's fine because it is a second income coming in, so it does become a problem.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We will have our last question of the morning.

Gary Sykes.

MR. SYKES: Oh, I was . . .

MR. IMIG: Barbara, could I just . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: David, go ahead and ask.

MR. IMIG: . . . one amplification on that. Seventy-seven percent of the male teachers in the state of Texas right now have to moonlight -- 77%. And you think how can they then perform an adequate job the next day after working that second shift or that second job?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Of course teachers have always had to moonlight in the summer too.

MR. IMIG: Yes.

MS. PETERSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Gary.

MR. SYKES: I intend to review evidence on salary in the testimony I'm preparing, but my sense of the data on it is that it's a subject about which more nonsense is spoken than anything else. Put another way, there is no good, adequate data that would allow you to say much sensible about salaries. For example, to be able to make assertions about the effects of salaries for attracting or not attracting people you would need to look at trends adjusted for inflation in comparison with comparable work. There are no -- there's no such data of that sort available that both adjust for inflation and allows you to look at salary trends for teaching in comparison with comparable occupations. You also need to factor in such things as the state of the labor market. The fact is, in a market where there is a surplus of workers you're going to have a very difficult time getting salary increases. Simply as a function of the labor market, you don't get salary increases when you have a surplus of workers. And that's just a -- that's just a fact of life for any line of work. The evidence -- the critical question is not state by state comparisons because within state variation in salaries and in the ability to attract teachers is as great as between state variation. The critical problems tend to be in the distribution of teachers, particularly with respect to inter-city and rurally isolated districts where it's terribly difficult to attract and hold teachers. And the limited amount of evidence that economists have provided on the effects of salary incentives in -- in rectifying distribution problems is that increments of 12 - 13 percent above the base are not successful in holding teachers. And I'm speaking now particularly of efforts that have been done in England where there have been -- where there is a national pay scale and they've tried to provide so-called allowances of exceptional difficulty for certain schools where there have been those kinds of salary increments. And also, the limited amount of evidence in cities like Los Angeles where again they have had special allowances for teaching in the intercity. And the evidence doesn't indicate that increments of that amount are very successful. In some ways I think the problem is to deal with other -- other kinds of rewards in teaching in addition to salary.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: That's a positive note to end on.

We are both pleased and encouraged by the number of request that we have today to testify before the Commission. Due to the limited time remaining and our desire to hear all those who wish to appear, we will have made arrangements for additional -- an additional room for the late afternoon session beginning at 4:15. The Commissioners Marston, Sommer, and Crosby have agreed to accept testimony in the Max Cooba Room which is one the second floor. Staff will be available to direct you to this session. All testimony given will be recorded and become a part of the formal record whether it is given here, or in the Max Cooba Room, or submitted through the mail. And I will give you the name and the address of the person to whom you might submit that testimony. And his name is, Dr. Milton Goldberg. He's in room 639; 1200 19th Street, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20208. Anyone who would like that address may just see me afterwards. I'll repeat it once more. Dr. Milton Goldberg; Room 639; 1200 19th Street, N.W.; Washington, D.C. 20208.

Our last bit of business. The following witnesses will be heard in the order listed beginning at 4:15 here in this particular auditorium. And they are Mary Ramzer, Eugene Kelly, Jr., Richard Hodges, James Grey, Robert Dickson, Pat Woodall, Asley Morgan, Wayne Wheatley, Robert Fonteneau.

The following witnesses will be heard in the order listed beginning at 4:15 in the Max Cooba Room; William Drumming, Debbie Tohoe, Eunice Simms, Donald Galler, James Collins, Ann Levie, Bill Katzenmeyer, Walter Mike, and Joe Hasenstaff.

We will be -- now break to allow the Commissioners to meet with the press and for lunch. The hearing will reconvene at 1:30. Thank you all for your attention.

(Whereupon, at 12:17 a luncheon recess was taken to reconvene at 1:30.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:30 p.m.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Many individuals have been invited to present testimony on programs in which they are involved or on perspectives they have on the topics before us today. Rather than announce the complete list now, I will introduce each person in the order listed on the agenda. Each will have five to seven minutes in which to make a statement. The electronic device will beep after five minutes to help us stay on schedule, and I think all of you can hear it. It's right back here. Okay. The electronic device will beep again at the end of the seven minutes, and I think Susan will raise her hand just for effect -- not just for effect.

Again presentations will be followed by a brief questioning period. There will be a more comprehensive discussion following the completion of all the presentations.

Our first speaker will be Gail MacColl, a Senior Research Associate from the National Institute of Education.

Gail.

MS. MacCOLL: I was asked to speak at this hearing as an expert on organization and management of schools. To examine the question of teacher preparation as it effects and is effected by the school as a workplace and education as a career setting. I've framed my remarks around three assumptions. Each of which raises questions about teacher preparation and about skill development and renewal on the job. These stem from the condition that teachers don't teach in institutions of undergraduate preparation. They teach in schools and it's the conditions on the job and the work of actual teachers, not those who think they might be teachers but never become them, that are important.

Now my three key assumptions. One is that that preparing excellent teachers does little good if the conditions of the job don't provide the satisfactions to keep them there. So we want to look at job conditions and the satisfactions that they provide, and the implications of requirements for job satisfaction on teacher preparation, both preservice and in the professional light.

Secondly; to achieve excellence in education, we need not only excellent teachers but effective schools. I reveiwed the effective schools literature and asked myself what does the literature of effective schools imply about the roll of teachers and, therefore, about the kind of preparation that teachers should have.

Thirdly; it seemed to me that to have both teacher satisfaction and school effectiveness you must have conditions of work that enable effective instruction to take place. Teacher preparation doesn't create these conditions. They are the product of policies, management practices, and the quality of leadership elsewhere in the educational system. So as we consider the problem of teacher preparation, we should also look at these other aspects of school and district operations that may impede well prepared teachers in the conduct of their work.

Now I reveiwed the literature on job satisfaction which comes from a broader context of education, And I've quoted in an outline that I've prepared some extra copies of which are available outside, and we'll have in a later paper a list of those job satisfaction elements. I think several of them are particularly pertinent to the satisfaction of teachers and have implications for teacher preparation.

One is; people seek in jobs an achievable level of challenge. A level of challenge that matches their abilities and preparations. If a job is boring the person either quits trying or just plain quits. This can happen in teaching if the teacher is doing the same thing over and over, year after year, with no opportunity for constructive change or professional growth. If you're interested in growth oriented professional education, it's probably tied to the development of some kinds of new roles and responsibilities for which a teacher could be prepared and into which a teacher could move as he or she gains experience and confidence on the job. So we're talking about implications for inservice training, career development and also about probably looking at teacher roles to allow for this kind of professional program development. On the other hand, if the job is too complex it becomes beyond a person's ability to manage it. There are two types of circumstances under which this might take place. One would be that the individual just is not prepared to handle a reasonable level of challenge. If this is the case, the implication for teacher preparation is that the areas of deficiency should be identified and technical assistance and administrative, supervisory support should be available to this individual to remediate that area left in preparation. If, on the other hand, it's found that this is a general condition which effects all teachers, then probably inservice training is not the answer. Probably you should then look at what are the policies and the conditions that are creating this overload and you should again change teacher roles, look at the kinds of policies and their effects on education, and make changes at the level of policy. Not at the level of teacher preparation.

Second, I would like to focus on the existence of what this researcher I'm quoting has called a just and informative system of rewardance. Now you will be happy to know that I'm not talking about money. Pay is a part of this , but I think that there are other kinds of rewards that can be offered to teachers through their work setting and through their continuing staff development that has been very much overlooked. What is meant by an informative system of rewards is a system which provides solid, credible information to the person about performance which is tied to recognition, overt recognition of good performance, and which includes accurate information about areas of deficiency. These are things which people seek in the workplace and which are too little provided in the workplace of education. An effective system of informative feedback is based on frequent observations of performance tied to specific behaviors, not to general traits or qualities, is credible and in a consistent framework. And if it is aimed at improvement, experts recommend that it be divorced from the formal system of promotion and reward. Now it is perfectly possible to have this kind of thing in education. It doesn't necessarily take more money, but it takes a different way of looking at who views teacher performance and how information is shared.

We have evidence that principals think that they review teacher performance often and give teachers information about their performance. But if you ask teachers, they say, no, this doesn't happen. Then people say, well why rely on the principal for this. How can one principal go about a school and do all this and give all this frequent information to teachers? And one answer is, don't rely on the principal for that. Sure principals should be aware of those kinds of things in the schools but what are colleagues for. Could we not, in our preservice preparation for teachers and in the roles we urge on them in the school, assist them in being constructive observers and critics of their peers performance, and in assisting each other in improving. And again I reiterate that this should be divorced from any punishment, punitive kinds of things. That -- that we can provide more for teachers growing professionally by working with other teachers. And I think again this adds implications for the preservice training of teachers. Do we give them the skills to do this? Do we teach them that part of the role as a teacher is to be a good colleague to those with whom you teach? I think these are things that preservice educators should look at.

There are two other major elements of job satisfaction to lead into the effective schools and the policy area. One is, people find work satisfying when the working conditions facilitate the accomplishment of work goals. I don't think we should forget that people are at work -- will come there initially because they want to do good work, and they need conditions of work which will facilitate this.

And lastly, they want supervisors and colleagues who share their work values and contribute to the -- the accomplishment of these work values. So a job situation in which people help each other do good work and in which admistrators, policy makers, and supervisors provide the conditions that sustain good work will not only be satisfied for teachers, but if you notice that the schools literature -- this is a description of an effective school. It has clear goals of standards for performance. It provides information and support for growth for students as well as for faculty. And I think the important thing for training, again, is that it uses teachers as colleagues. This is an element that comes out very strongly in all of the effective schools literature.

Teachers as students seek the same things that teachers do, and these can all be tied together in an effective school. But it requires colleagueship role for teachers, and I'm not sure that we're providing this. The question I have is; does teacher preparation prepare teachers to be an effective member of an adult work group? Preparing people to work effectively individually is not the same thing. The experts who have looked at this, who will say, you may be better off with a bunch of people who had their limitations but are able to work together to make the most of their strength and to minimize the effects of these limitations on their work collectively, than with the collection of people who are top-notched to began with. And this to me means, I'm not going to stand here and tell you, get rid of the less able for teachers, grab -- try to grab the more able for teachers. I think those things are important, but let's look also at what we can do to make the most with the materials that we have. And this, I think, is a major responsibility of continuing education for teachers. There are skills of working with others. There are ways of sharing and arranging goals, such as every person teaches in their area of strength. And I think that the districts, and through their staff development programs, and that the weight of the (Indistinguishable) should be looking at these things.

Finally, I want to mention a number of policies and management practices which may impede good teaching and which we should take a careful look at as we see excellence in education. Many of these will be familiar to you. Student assignment and grouping, is it done with an eye to the requirements of effective instruction and to student needs. Scheduling of classes in special programs and events, does this respect the need for concentrated instructional time. Coordination of generalists and specialists efforts -- from what I can tell, generalists -- the growth of specialism had occurred by accretion in schools. Specialisms have grown up and they haven't ever been very well integrated into the entire work package in schools. We find that a comparative study of teachers and physicians who work in an organizational setting, a group practice setting, and the disruption that occurred to the client being passed from the generalists to the specialists in education was much greater than in the medical setting because educational organizations paid so little attention to building articulation between the two to sharing information about the client of such that it did become an experience -- the go -- the experience of going to the specialists, help the client, instead of just subjecting the client to a new approach. We have evidence from the study of some special education in districts, of a district where the reading program used by the Special Ed teacher was entirely different than the reading problem used in the classroom, so that the less able student was faced with learning twice the number of vocabulary words as the able student and was -- was trying to read by two entirely separate methods at once. Now both of those teachers may have been excellently prepared, but how in the world could you have excellent education for those students with that lack of program coordination.

Discipline policy is another contributor. Does every teacher have to invent a discipline system and enforce it in their own classroom. Or is there some common system of discipline such that all students can understand it, and all teachers can refer to it, and don't have to spend classroom time on that.

Teacher assignment and transfer; there are a lot of problems with this now that there are reductions in force.

And I think that, again, needs to be very carefully looked at.

Teacher timings and functions; we have some evidence that collective bargaining agreements have cut the number of our -- of minutes of instruction per day by three percent by adding teacher preparation time, parent conference time, administrative time, and so on. Now the evidence as we have it so far doesn't say that this is good or bad from -- for education. But it does say these policies were not invented with an eye to decreasing instructional time but they've had that effect. Shouldn't we at least look at it? Shouldn't we at least look at the effect on restricting meeting time for teachers in a school which is trying to improve it's program and which can only do that by getting teachers to work together?

And finally, a plea for looking at inservice and staff development in districts. It's -- from all I can tell we do not have real staff development programs in many districts. We don't have programs that diagnose individual teacher needs and give the teachers assistance for remediation on any systematic basis. We don't have programs that provide for career growth for teachers, within teaching as opposed to going through administration. We don't have staff development programs that take an entire school staff or program staff and get them to work together to effect some school goal, or indeed, to get teachers in the whole district to work together towards a common goal of education, partly because they don't have a common goal of education. But I asked myself to think of school districts which have nine-million dollar budgets. Can you imagine a nine million dollar corporation which doesn't have a well developed staff, retraining and growth program, for it's employees to make them more effective at that corporation's business. You can imagine it in the world of schools and I'm hoping that that will change.

Sorry, I guess I get to take two questions, right.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Yeah, Gail. You can take them standing or you can take them sitting.

MR. SOMMER: Or can you take them at all?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Or can you take them at all, right.

MR. FOSTER: I noticed, Gail, in here. That on page three of the memo that you gave us, that you talk about high academic learning time . . .

MS. MacCOLL: Right.

MR. FOSTER: . . . and I suppose that's another way of expressing time on tasks?

MS. MacColl: Right. They express it as academic learning time because it involves not only the time spent on tasks but with materials which are, to use my own phrase, at an achievable level of challenge for the student.

MR. FOSTER: Un hunh. Do we -- do we have any -- could you add anything to what you've said here by maybe just identifying this? Can you add anything to this? And I ask -- and I also ask for somebody else to comment on this and his name is Gary -- uh -- Fenstermacher. Can you -- can you tell us anything that we -- you think we should know about how to achieve more time on task by the students? Either one of you or both of you.

MS. MacCOLL: Well I'm not an expert in pedagogy, and I would hestitate to answer the question in any detail on that basis. My point in putting that in the paper is, this is a finding which has come out from research. That it is important to look at how much time students put in and what kinds of materials. Is this finding being reflected in teacher preservice preparation and inservice programs. You know, are teachers even being told this is important. Hey, as you review your performance you ought to be looking at this.

MR. FOSTER: Un hunh.

Madam Chairman, could we ask Gary to comment on that?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I'm not sure -- is Gary here?

MR. FOSTER: I think I see him.

MR. FENSTERMACHER: It's an enormous question. Now what we might be able to do to help teachers increase time on the tasks. The National Institute of Education has a book on the subject called "Time To Learn". There is another one coming out in about eight to ten months and not having had time to think about it, I wouldn't quite know where to begin. But I can assure you that there are -- there will be, shortly, two references that are going to prove very helpful to you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, Gary.

Jay.

MR. SOMMER: I wonder whether we realize that some of the things are really common sense things. If I can spend one hour with my students on a foreign language, and if I don't have that common sense to realize that -- the more time, the more effective time, of course, I spend on that teaching the more saturated that teaching will become or the learning will become. I don't know whether I would want institutions who are preparing teachers to go to the point of, you know, finding the ridiculous -- what else can we prepare them for -- for -- for sneezing, walking, and talking. You know, that sort of thing. You mentioned something and maybe I just don't understand it. You were talking about the fact that some of our teachers, or future teachers get to the job and they don't know how to interelate with the other people. I think that that's a social lack on the part of the teacher who is coming in, or a reflection of the environment which can do this to you which is there, but I don't know how one prepares a teacher for this.

MS. MacCOLL: Okay, well, I didn't mean that this was just a social lack on the individual's part, but rather than the role expectation that teachers have is; I work as an individual in my classroom, is it proper for me to go to another teacher across the hall and ask for help? Is it proper if I'm a more experience teacher to look into your classroom and say, "Gee, you know, I can see that you're experiencing some frustration, so why don't we talk about this." I think the important point is that the role doesn't prepare teachers that this is the legitimate part of what they should do. You probably know the phrase "egg-crate school". That every teacher -- and I've seen so much stuff, inservice education, particularly, which treats the teacher as if you are in an isolation booth with your students and here's what you should do. That there is no suggestion that this is a collective endeavor. That we should work together. That I should open my classes for your examination and you'll help me and then there is a reciprocity involved. It's a -- it's a way of looking at the role differently and a conceiving of the teacher as not just the purveyor of information and the development of skills within students, but as a member of the working group. And I think Gary mentioned this morning modern management techniques. If you look at the -- the approaches to productivity growth today, other sectors, they are almost all based on a work group, not on individual preparation, and that is the point that I'd like to make . . .

MR. SOMMER: Yeah, and that's quite clear enough.

MS. MacCOLL: . . . But people have to think of themselves as a member of a work group and their training should lead them to do so.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Our last question, Margaret.

MS. MARSTON: Not a question, but just a follow-up comment. Mr. Foster, Dr. Goldberg submitted testimony on the hill on September the 11th, and it's in our packet on -- and on that page he cites four studies that compare the achievement of students in two kinds of classes. Classes with teachers who have received training on time management and those that have not, and the amount of student acheivement increase in those who have -- have received that management time training -- it's quite significant.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Gail.

MR. FOSTER: Thank you very much, Margaret.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: They seem to have settled the problem in Atlanta. They have a group here coined a phrase, they seem to be making it work -- called the Community of Believers. You might take that home to all of our counties, and towns, and cities. It's a great concept.

Our next speaker will be Kathy Jones who is an Assistant Professor of Reading and Education at Rowan State Community College, Harrington Tennessee.

Kathy Jones.

MS. JONES: Madam Chair and members of the Commission, I'm Kathy Jones, a teacher from Kingston Tennessee.

As an active member of the National Education Association, and a member of the NEA's Instruction and Professional Development Committee, I spend a great deal of time talking to teachers in this region about excellence in teacher education. I would like to share with you today their concerns about their own preparation programs. Time constraints prohibit a full explanation of these concerns and I would ask that you refer to the printed NEA statement distributed earlier today.

Specifically, four factors effect the quality of education in schools; the talent attracted to the teacher profession, the quality of preservice education, the availability and type of staff development in training, and lastly, the environment in which teachers practice.

Two essentials are necessary to attract talented people to the profession. Good salaries and other benefits and professional legitimacy. Unfortunately, the current rewards for being a teacher on low pay, low status, and significantly less than appropriate involvement in critical professional decisions.

In 1980/'81, according to our research statistics the national average salary paid to classroom teachers was $17,264.00, representing all levels of experience and all levels of academic credentials, reflecting also, tremendous differences in pay scales in the states. That figure compares unfavorably even with the entry level salaries for engineering which is $20,136.00; mathematics and statistics, $17,604.00; computer sciences, $17,712.00; and the liberal arts, $13,296.00. Currently the main entry level salary for teachers holding a Bachelor's Degree is $11,758.00. Until we all recognize that teachers are the central figures in the world of schooling and must receive the compensation and respect equal to that role, we cannot hope to attract the best from the professional talent pool.

In terms of the quality of training that teachers receive, major responsibilities should lie with the total education community and that does include teachers. To that end, the NEA, taught the following essentials for teacher education. Number one; admission to colleges of education programs must be based on various types of evidence indicating potential success as a classroom teacher.

Two; teacher education programs must be designed and developed based on what the practitioner says needs to be known and done for the beginning effective practice.

Three; teacher education must be constructed so that the beginning teacher can apply the knowledge base to knowledge base to the classroom situation.

Four; recommendations for certification of graduates must be based on several types of information which is accumulated over the entire program which demonstrates the graduates ability to practice effectively. Standards for approving teacher education programs must insure that teachers can be effective when they begin to practice.

And lastly; the state agency for approving teacher education programs and certification of teachers must be free of inappropriate political influence and governed principally by teachers.

It's time teachers participated in the decisions being made for and about them. Afterall, who knows better than teachers what the problems of instructions are. What skills and knowledges are needed to function effectively in the class room and what research is needed to enhance the learning process? Teachers must also have opportunities and incentives for continuous professional growth. Continuing education for teachers should be an essential part of a career in teaching and a natural extension of preservice education. It should be based on teacher needs as identified by teachers; planned, governed, and evaluated by teachers and others directly related to the school enterprise and integrated into the professional assignment. Continuing education must be designed to reflect the fact that, just as with other professions, growth as a teacher is a life-long process. And I think this concept is best illustrated in the Teachers Center Progam. I would like to share with you some of the benefits which my fellow teaches feel have come out of their work with Centers.

The first Teacher Center had bridged the gap for new teachers between their ideological feelings about teaching when they enter the field and the realities of teaching itself. Teachers receive an immediate response to critical needs at Centers. District inservice programs are often planned a year in advance and as one or two day affairs.

Teacher Centers, on the other hand, are responsive to ongoing problems at any time throughout the school year. One teacher described an influx of Cambodians and Spanish into his school, and his colleagues felt that they were completely unprepared to deal with them. The Teachers Centers solved the problem by providing seminars in English as a second language.

Another Teachers Center brought in a reading consultant to work with the teachers which, by the way, the school district had chosen not to do. As a result, test scores in that district rose from the bottom to the middle range.

Finally, teachers must be able to practice in an environment which is condusive to effective application of their knowledge and skills. Teachers face not only instructional problems but others such as improper facilities for learning, inadequate supplies and equipment, overcrowded conditions, and lack of discipline. These problems cause teachers to experience very grave frustrations indigenous to the school systems, the community, and the parents in local govenment. Yet teachers are eager to work to alleviate these problems so that they can teach school. The work that they are prepared to do.

Madam Chair, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the teachers and the need for improving teacher education. And I strongly recommend to you, for those of you who have not visited a Teachers Center, that you go and see the enthusiasm and commitment of teachers as they participate in the decision making process about the real world of teaching and learning. And I would like to extend any help which any NEA may give to you in that endeavor.

In closing I would like to quote, as others have today, Earnest Boyer, in a speech teaching in America. He said,

> "The quality of education in
> this nation is inextricably

> lengthed to the quality of
> teaching, and if the teaching
> profession is diminished, the
> nation's future is diminished
> too."

And if the teaching -- the quality of education in this nation can rise no higher than the quality of teaching. If public support continues to decline, the intellectual and economic future of this nation will be threatened. We confront, in short, an education crisis. And we must respond with a sense of urgency and vision.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you.

Do we have any quick questions to clarify anything. Otherwise, we will wait for the discussion period which will be right after the break.

Yvonne, do you have a question?

MS. LARSEN: One very brief one. You have spoken from the teacher's perspective. How important do you feel that prospective is to interact with the administrative staff and to be part of the team effort?

MS. JONES: Oh, I think we've always felt that that was very important and strive to do that. I think no organization works without all parts working together and understanding the function.

MS. LARSEN: So if teachers buy into goals and objectives within a school site that should make the school a more effective school?

MS. JONES: Certainly and teachers ought to be a part in determining what those objectives and goals will be.

MS. LARSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Kathy.

Our next speaker is Mary Lou Romaine. She's the President of the Atlanta Federation of Teachers.

MS. ROMAINE: On behalf of Local 1565 of the American Federation of Teachers, I appreciate very much the opportunity to address this hearing with the National Commission on Excellence in Education. The subject of teaching and teacher education is the topic about which I feel I have a great deal to say. Some of my testimony today will be quite personal, illustrated by the very vivid experiences that I've had recently as Inteacher Education Programs. And finally as a teacher and finally as a Union President, serving the needs of many members who have certification in other job related problems. These experiences, I feel, are indicative of the problems that we face in teacher education in Georgia and Nationwide.

My mother was an English teacher, and as an adolescent I rebelled against the thought of even being a teacher. I attended a small private Liberal Arts School for women. A school with an excellence in liberal arts education. I was a music -- music major. And I left to attend this college at Georgia State University after my junior year. Because of that transfer I did not take the one or two courses that were available at the Liberal Arts College and were offered as teacher education rather reluctantly. I was indoctrinated with the prevailing wisdom that if you had a good liberal arts background you could be the best in any profession including inteaching. I do not believe that to be the case. I have never regreted the transfer. I had some very excellent courses here at this university in spite of the fact that many schools of education are considered to have primarily Mickey Mouse courses in education. I took two of the most taxing and exciting courses in my college career. Later when I entered and did not, unfortunately, complete a Masters Degree Program, I found some of the courses not to be quite of that quality. But I will say that the first courses that I took were excellent. I did practice teaching in Atlanta public schools, and taught for six years both in music and in early childhood -- in elementary. I was conscious of constant threats to music programs, to the arts programs, and, therefore, I wanted to be multiply certified.

As far as I can tell, the evaluation of new teachers in Atlanta public schools has inproved dramatically. I still feel that vast improvements need to be made in our city, and state, and the nation in evaluation of tenure teachers. And particularly in the support given to teachers when they are asked to change their teaching styles, or technique, or when they are asked to adjust to a change in curriculum.

The very difficult task of assisting teachers in correcting their classroom behavior has definitely not been mastered by most administrators. If a school administrator does not have adequate knowledge or experience to guide a study of the curriculum, an many do not, then that administrator often lacks the finesse to instruct another adult, meaning the teacher, in such a way that a positive behavior change will occur. We will never achieve excellence in education if our school administrators are not leaders in terms of knowledgeable curriculum, and teaching techniques, and in terms of ability to motivate teachers to change. As a Union Representative much of my job involves counseling of teachers. I have found that administrative support for teachers is a rarity. But I do believe that support for new teachers or for mature teachers, who are faced with dramatic curriculum or other changes, is practically nonexistent. Many teachers leave the profession each year. Probably more would leave if the unemployment rate were not so high. We need to be concerned not only about those, or the high percentage of those who are leaving, but the high percentage who remain on their jobs but are -- who -- who are so discouraged that they have lost that spark that is vital to the teaching learning process.

Our National Organization, the American Federation of Teachers, has a proposal which we believe would support new teachers and prevent them from being overwhelmed by the demands of the classrooms. AFT suggests a one to three year internship program, similar to the internship program in the medical profession, during which new teachers would work with experienced teachers who would demonstrate various teaching styles in methodologies. The internship program would involve cooperation with colleges and universities in terms of providing research for teacher effectiveness and preparation of supervisory personnel. I have attached to my remarks an example which discribes the concept of teacher internship in more detail.

For support of experienced teachers in there continuous inservice growth, and I agree with the previous speaker that there is a great lack in that regard, AFT recommends the establishment of Teacher Centers.

I have much more to say, but I will try to be brief.

You've heard something about the concept of Teacher Centers. Teachers have been so brainwashed into believing that a professional is the closest thing to a propped up dead person where often our opinion is not asked. We are -- in fact if our opinion is given it is disregarded. So the Teacher Center was meant to be a place where teachers have the opportunity to share their vast expertise. The field tested successes along with cooperation of colleges and universities again, so that we can create a knowledge base about what works in the classroom.

It's amazing to me, and I want to say a few more words about professionalism, that we expect positive results from teachers who are so battered that their own self image is near zero. Much has been said already about the lack of salaries and other kinds of incentives for teachers. But we know that a child cannot succeed if his self concept is poor but we allow teachers to be bludgeoned into states of blind, unprotesting obediance and at the same time we expect them to lead their students to high achievement levels. Just this week a high school teacher told me about some of her problems with rodents and other insects in the schools, about water fountains that don't function. Teachers tell us about the lack of planning periods in their schools, and teachers must be the only group of professionals that do not even have, throughout the state of Georgia, a lunch period. The only group of workers, even prisoners have lunch breaks. But if the physical and mental environment does not tell teachers that their work is valuable, their ideas welcomed, their needs for materials respected and fulfilled, how can we expect teachers to convey a feeling of selfworth to their students?

Two years ago this state experienced a 5,000 person teacher shortage. Last year in a survey conducted by AFT Incorporation with GFT, fully 75 percent of Atlanta teachers said that if they had to do it over again they would not become teachers. Surely we cannot expect excellence in teaching and excellence in achievement from teachers who are so disheartened.

I have gone on to say that we support evaluation systems of teachers. AFT, unlike the NEA, supports testing of teachers prior to their entry into the field. We do believe that federal support for this endeavor, for public education, is extremely important. In fact, federal support of public education is a crucial element in the strength and vitality of this nation.

Again I thank you for the opportunity to make these remarks.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. Would you like to take a question or two at this point?

MS. ROMAINE: Sure, glad to.

MS. LARSEN: You left us dangling on the evaluation part and in the printed document you speak to the evaluation document that is in place in Atlanta -- if only administrators could learn to implement properly. Would you please explain briefly?

MS. ROMAINE: Yes, we have a fairly good evaluation instrument which has been involved with teacher input in Atlanta. The problems we have faced in counseling our members is that many of the administrators do not even follow the printed page. In other words, do not visit for observation at appropriate times. Do not sit down and counsel with the teacher after they've been in the room and say, these are the things that I'd like them to improve. And as I pointed out in my written comments as a young teacher in Atlanta, I was never, never for six years, formally observed by a principal. I think much of that has changed in the Atlanta system. Much of it needs to be changed throughout Georgia. We need a fair instrument that is developed with the input of teachers and it needs to be fairly administrative. Administrators need to be taught too. They need to have inservice too. And how to evaluate is very difficult, not only to evaluate, but as I mentioned to correct the behavior, to present another adult with some methods, some examples of how to correct their behavior.

MS. LARSEN: How could we come to consensus on what is fair?

MS. ROMAINE: Well, you know, we have used evaluation systems throughout the country for many, many years. And I think that an evaluation system that allows the teacher, as the Atlanta system does, to create some of her own goals and then to see if she meets those goals in cooperation with the school administrator. What do you think you need to do in your classroom? And it's very difficult to be fair but that takes -- it takes testing and training of administrators.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. That sounds very much the type of thing that business employers with a management plan for the year.

The next speaker, Janet Towslee Collier, who is familiar to all of us by now. She's shepherd us around here for two days. She's the Assistant Dean of the College of Education at Georgia State University.

MS. COLLIER: Bob and I decided . . .

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Let me change my tape please.

(Brief pause while reporter changes tape.)

COURT REPORTER: We're back on the record.

MS. COLLIER: I'm here today as the one educator representing the Association of Teacher Educators which is the only national individual membership organization devoted solely to the improvement of education and teacher education for both school based and campus based educators. The members of the Association of Teacher Educators come from a variety of backgrounds and represent a broad spectrum of interest. A large segment is from the public schools and represents classroom teachers, classroom supervisors, administrators, as well as those individuals responsible for inservice in the public schools. Another segment represents those persons involved with teacher education in the colleges and universities. This includes faculty members, supervisors, and administrators. The third segment of our membership represents the public and private agencies such as, State Departments of Educations, Federal Agencies, and various professional groups. There are many ATE members present here today and I'd like to thank you for being here. And I think we probably have representation from every group that I have listed.

We have one person I'd like to recognize. That's Dr. James Collins who is at the very back. He's a past President of ATE and will be speaking to you later today. Let Jim wave at you.

ATE's constitute -- constitution states the belief that quality of teacher education can best be improved through the cooperative efforts of all concerned. This belief is carried out through the organization structure. Policy is developed by our National Delegate Assembly with delegates from each state and each regional unit. One mandate is that half the delegates must represent public and private schools, and that's a very unique element. The remainder represents higher education in state agencies. The Board of Directors, are similarly organized. And then out of the seven elected Board members, two must represent public schools, two must represent higher education, and three members are at large.

In essence, the Association of Teacher Educators represents the interested teacher educator in all of the major areas, public and private, college and university, and governmental agencies. In fact we house the form of Field Directors. The only national group representing all the Directors of Student Teaching including classroom supervisors.

After the Association was invited to present at this hearing, our Board met and we discussed at great length the concerns, the pros and cons, we would like to share with the Commission. There are a lot of items which have been addressed already this morning. For sake of time I'd like to list those things that have been dealt with through our Delegate Assembly either through policy statements or supportive information. We've dealt with teacher shortages, we've dealt with low pay and retention of teaching staff, broad based versus specific based training, criteria for admission to teacher education, inservice and staff development, Bachelors versus Masters Degree as the entry level into teaching, impact of state and federal regulations, the role of teacher certification, development of curriculum materials, and lastly the role of professional organizations on the status of teaching and teacher education.

I would like for the Commission to recognize that ATE is just one of many fine organizations that does strive to demonstrate as well as foster excellence in the educational process. Like many others, we do this through the publications of our journals, various books and news letters. A unique way we at ATE encourage excellence is through the awards arena. We give each year distinguish programs in teacher education. This is received only as the candidates are in consortium between higher education and public education. Research awards in the field of teacher education. We give Doctoral Disertation Awards to encourage excellence.

I would like to refer the Commission members and my colleagues here in the audience here today to read the position statement that we provided to you and it lists all of the recent recipients of our awards.

In closing let me say. If we do not assume that teaching is the foundation for all of the professions then teacher education is crucial if a solid foundation is to be laid. And the professional organizations can assists in the development of this concept at the various national, state, and local level. On behalf of the Association of Teacher Educators I would like to encourage the Commission members to consult the various professional organizations in the development of their report. I would also like to state as member of the 1983 Conference Planning Committee of ATE that we have chosen as our theme "Excellence through Diversity" and we will be addressing at this conference next January all the same topics that have been dealt with today.

Thank you for allowing me to share my comments with you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Can you tell us where the conference is going to be held?

MS. COLLIER: It will be in Orlando, Florida . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Orlando, Florida.

MS. COLLIER: . . . at the Sheridan Twin Towers, January 29th, 1983.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: That's a good time to be in Orlando, especially if you're from Michigan.

We'll go on. Our next speaker is Robert Fortenberry, Superintendent of the Jackson City Schools, Jackson Mississippi.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Madam Chairman, it's good to be here today. It's good to be back in Georgia where people like I don't talk funny. I'm pleased to testify before this esteemed Commission because of my deep interest in eradicating some folklore, that is, the unsupported body of notions that surrounds educations in general and the teaching profession specifically.

Any effort to improve our country's educational system must focus largely on teaching performance and teacher training programs. Dr. Madeline Hunter, a widely respected researcher in the area, has said that the changing professional competency of the teacher will result in a more pronounced acceleration in student learning than changing any other factor under the control of the schools. Does this claim imply that changing the competency of teachers would result in greater achievement than expanding the school day? I believe so. Does it mean that improved teacher performance would fuel achievement more than a rewritten diversified curriculum? I think it does. Dramatically improved teacher competency could yield the far reaching results necessary to effectively and finally discard excuses for why students do not achieve.

The Jackson Mississippi public school system this year implemented a formula that puts performance on equal footing with seniority in staff reduction decisions. By 1985 the performance factor will count three times as much as seniority when contract decisions are made. If perfomance is to figure so significally in reemployment and it is time that it be in the forefront of all educational discussions, performance, then a more scientific approach to teaching -- teacher training must be taken. There are few, if any, born teachers. Effective teaching can be broken down into sets of specific skills and identifiable behaviors. Research by Fisher and others has shown us that teachers ability to diagnose student's skill levels, to prescribe appropriate tasks, to interact with students, to provide feedback, to give directions, to focus student attention, all, are related to student achievement. We do not have, nor have we ever had the luxury of leaving teachers to determine, on their own, the course that students must take and whether they have succeeded. A scientific-based training program can only be to advance the profession and improve children's chances for success.

The training program also should prepare teachers to teach from a base of objectives. What is served daily cannot be left to the whims of the chef, there must be safeguards to insure, for example, that algebra -- that the algebra 1 course, that is the prerequisite for higher math courses, offer the same challenges to students, no matter which school they attend, or which teacher they have. In our school district we're calling this menu for what is served throughout the school system the common body of knowledge, that is something that teachers described. Defining precisely what is to be taught, I think, will allow teachers more opportunity to refine how it is taught. And, I think that is a significant professional right. The teacher training programs and staff development, therefore, must stress pedogogy as well as the knowledge of subject matter. The teaching profession will be elevated and children will be served better by tightening the eligibility and entry requirement for newcomers to the profession. Haphazard education majors certainly would be discouraged by a five-year teacher education program, this has been spoken to several times earlier and I do advocate the five-year approach instead of licensing those coming out of a four-year program, and probably there should be at least a two-year probationary period.

At present, school systems have virtually no input in who is qualified to teach. Teachers are trained by universities and are licensed by states. Teachers are -- they come to the school districts with a seal of approval that reveals nothing of their aptitudes and abilities. If they're released from contract they still would remain licensed teachers. Very early in the teacher education program there should be opportunities for individuals to recognize their aptitudes for the profession.

I'm saying here what has also been said earlier in the day, that very early in the teaching process there needs to be time for the people to float between the university and the school because a lot of people think of teaching as they were -- as if they were still students, and it's altogether a different set of skills and they need to determine that very early.

Realizing aptitudes and performance expectations early in the training program will force the teacher education students to determine if he or she will survive in a profession whose effective members are those who believe all students can learn and who take the responsibility upon themselves to see that they do. One thing that needs to be ingrained early is a committment to all students. While my last comments may have taken -- be taken as radical, but if they are radical we mean to get to the root of the problem. If we're going to make teaching a highly specialized profession requiring a rigorous scientific based training program then there must be attractive salaries to further entice the best minds to select the education careers. Across the board payscales imply that teaching staff members with equal certification and experience are of equal value at the school districts and offer no flexibility. The school district cannot reward superior performance with higher pay. It cannot hold or attract science or math majors who want higher salaries that business and industry offer. I think we have to move toward some kind of variable pay plan, that is essential in my judgement. Awareness and the need of the possibility of higher pay for certain subject areas should be stressed in the teacher profession. Education, for too long, has provided a professional nesting ground for mediocrity. Reality based training and performance based salary could precipitate the shake-up needed for the improved conscience that will lead to greater achievement.

No doubt that will stimulate some discussion and I'd be happy to respond to it.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I think it will. Very good.

Our next speaker will be Nicholas Hobar, who is the Executive Director, the Division of General and Special Educational Development, the West Virginia Department of Education.

MR. HOBAR: My remarks will represent the positions and viewpoints of the National Association of State Directors in Teacher Education and Certification.

We're very pleased to be here, invited to come and talk about are perspective and all the variables that have been mentioned at this point. If you have the paper that I have presented I will follow that pulling off major concepts on this newsprint.

I think it's important from a context point of view that the NASDTEC Association is composed of state directors of teacher education and certification. These are the individuals who work in state departments of education who are responsible for developing policy for the things that we've been talking about today. Those individuals are charged with leadership and administration of state teacher education programs and of certification. If someone is to be certified in a state it usually goes to these individuals offices. My particular responsibility in West Virginia is both in school curriculum and in teacher education and certification. So, those issues would be dealt with in our office. How does NASDTEC performance and professional association operate? It provides information to other states, professional organizations, and just about everybody who's been in this room today on what the policies are in states, what supply and demand trends look like and so forth. It provides leadership training to state education agencies staff in how to interpret research on school effectiveness and teacher effectiveness and change -- and translate that into standards and policies. It provides resources, such as, proceedings of professional organization meetings. And, NASDTEC deals with, for example, last year we conducted a conference on how to solve school staffing needs through inovative teacher education programs. And we -- and NASDTEC essentially is a technical assistance body to state departments of education. So, that's the perspective of the individuals that I represent today through the executive committee. That also includes Puerto Rico and Washington D.C.

The major issue that I think needs to be addressed is the public's interest in teacher education and certification. And, in a state, the public's interest is represented through the state's standards for teacher education and certification. The only reason we have the schools and so forth is because, I think, we believe children, youth and adults are our nation's greatest resource, and the wisdom of the people in our country said, nurture that, we should have schools and the schooling process. They use public funds to support that -- the schools and schooling to nurture those resources. And the states have the constitutional mandate to carry out education. So, the responsibility for education is fixed within that context. So, these considerations must be reflected in state standards.

Now, we also maintain as state directors of certification and teacher education that state standards should reflect certain things. They should reflect what we know about learners and how they learn. It should be obvious, looking at state standards, that we have implemented those concepts that we have learned about in those areas. State standards should respond to the definition of public education, K-12, within the state. If we're unclear of what we want students to learn we're going to have double the problem in preparing people to teach something we do not know exists. So, the clearer the definition of public education, for what we want children to learn, the easier it is to establish standards that once colleges prepare teachers to achieve, they issue the certificate, it means that they have the skills to implement that education.

In addition, state standards should reflect the needs of learners and teachers beyond content. I think you've heard a lot of speakers talking about teachers have more to do in a classroom than just merely know the content, so standards should reflect that.

Also, standards should provide a data base for assuring the public's interest that these things are being taken care of. The testing programs, in many states, are now providing this data base for the public in a much more rigorous manner than we've ever had before. I think it's important to keep that context in mind because the things that we've been talking about today fit in this context.

I'd like to switch -- well, let me say one more thing. It's the position of the NASDTEC executive committee that the issue of establishing state standards for teacher ed as the mechanism to assure this public's interest was an ommission, as we viewed it, in the testimony guidelines, the state perspective and we're pleased that we're able to come though and present this point. Because, I think many of the things that we're talking about today are being addressed and need to be brought into the open.

I'd like to switch now to standards for teacher education in the context of excellence. Typically, standards of quality for teachers have been viewed as minimum standards. The tradional framework is to say that state standards reflect or equal minimum requirements. We can do that, we have the skills, we have demonstrated that throughout the country. When you talk about excellence in education it puts a new role to the State departments to start to define levels of excellence beyond minimums. And, so we need to assure the public of a minimum, or floor, of ability for teachers to implement the curriculum, but if you want to move into excellence the role of the state department needs to get into this kind of thing of identifying levels that represent the ideals of a profession. And, we might say this is the entry level and that a professional builds on their skills throughout their tenure. We can reflect those kinds of things in state policy.

Finally, I think it's important to distinguish the roles and responsibility in developing state policy that relates to teacher education and certification. I think in almost all states, I think except three, the State Board of Education is responsible for making policies that regard standards and certification. The State Superintendent of Schools does his charge to pull proposals together to take to the Board. The Superintendent, two of which talked this morning, have a staff that work with them, and in a State Department of Education that's generally called an Educational Personnel Development office that deals with edu -- teacher education, certification and in-service education. There's also an office of school curriculum, office of special ed, office of research and so forth. If these individuals are to prepare standards for teachers that are meaningful they need to know what the direction of curriculum and instruction is.

Now, the groups that give technical assistance to the policy makers are groups such as ACTE, ATE and so forth. They have a valuable contribution to make and I think they've made their points this morning of what's the latest in research and development, so forth. What does it mean for state policy and state standards? It can feed into that process. These are professional organizations that do not have the responsibility, the primary responsibility for policy however. There are three groups at the national level made up state deparment of education people who do have that responsibility, the group, NASDTEC, that I'm respresenting today, National Counsel of States on In-Service Education are members of State Education Agencies who deal with in-service, and the interstate certfication project, how teachers are certified across the state lines.

As a summary, there are ten points that I made in the paper, that standards should reflect the public's interest, we do have program approval systems, they're becoming more rigorous with testing models. The expectations of the public must be addressed through state standards. The states are the responsible agency for education and therefore have the powers to set standards. State educational needs must be addressed and national bodies cannot address state needs. National standards cannot address state needs. State standards can address both state needs and national context. So, therefore, state standards are more comprehensive and we would take that sort of position and that would be the difference between state and national standards. The coordination of teacher education, all the variables that I talked about here, there's only one group that has the responsibility to pull that together from a legal perspective, and that's in the state education agencies.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. I think, as a national commission, that we're very aware of that, too. The problem is the question of the states really being the one in power and we are essentially making recommendations that perhaps they will want to implement and perhaps they will not.

The next speaker -- we're going to move along here and then save all questions for the discussion period so we can keep on schedule.

Our next speaker is Fred Loveday. He's the Executive Secretary of the Georgia Association of Independent Schools, Georgia Private Education Counsel.

MR. LOVEDAY: Madam chairman, members of the Commission. The purpose of this school as represented by the Georgia Private Education Counsel is to provide the best education possible for the young people enrolled in these schools. Currently, there are approximately 92,000 students in the non-public schools of the state located in 117 counties. While there is a wide diversity in the size, organization, emphasis and operation, the most salient common characteristic is the constant striving for excellence. Out of the experience, philosophy, purpose and dedication of educators in the private sector comes a long list of recommendations for maintaining excellence. However, due to the limitations of time and the topic of this forum my remarks are centered upon the thing that is central in an excellent school, good teachers in the classroom.

The main responsibility for providing good teachers lies with the head of the school. He must search for and find competent teachers, and once they are found he must provide an environment in which they can operate effectively. Teachers, in addition to being adequately prepared academically, must be able to strengthen the -- strengthen and enhance the aims, purpose and philosophy of the school.

Along with the basics in the classroom, schools emphasize in varying approaches character and moral concepts, initiative and individual responsibility, personal credoes and religious traditions, health and clean habits, civic pride and patriotism, self-discipline and respect for authority, citizenship and wholesome family living, and a global outlook, and an appreciation for our national heritage. These facets of the total learning process of a school are indeed important, however, they do not replace but rather are added to the central requirement of a good school, namely, sound instruction and learning.

As he evaluates potential teachers, the school head must take into account character, maturity, common sense, dedication, philosophy, personal beliefs and experience. The cardinal quality to be sought is a distinctive command of the subject to be taught. This is especially true for the middle and secondary grades. The school head must look for that applicant who's collegiate degree was earned in the standard liberal arts tradition. If mathematics is to be taught the teacher should have a sound major in mathematics, if history, a thorough major in history. No apology should be made for looking askance at the applicant who earned a degree by taking a bypass through the department or the college of education.

As a young administrator, some years ago, I was flabbergasted to hear a superior say, "If a teacher knows how to teach the subject doesn't make any difference." We insist, strongly, that the subject does make a difference.

Knowing mathematics makes for a much better teacher than merely knowing how to teach mathematics. A good combination is even better. Granted, some education courses are beneficial, some would be beneficial to all teachers. Granted, also, is the fact that a large part of the education courses are of so little value that they have made no strong contribution to the strength and excellence of American education.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much, Mr. Loveday.

Our next speaker will be James Lowden, he's the Executive Director of the Alabama Christian Education Association.

Mr. Lowden.

MR. LOWDEN: Madam chairman, members of the Commission. I am actually representing the American Association of Christian Schools, which is a national body. And, though I am the Executive Director for the Alabama Christian Education Association I am their Regional representative for the Southeast region and that's why I'm here today representing the Christian schools in forty states in the United States which they comprise in that association.

I'm going to depart from my printed remarks mix a combination of both -- I would like to respond to some of the presenters this morning in the context of Christian education. Private Christian education does not face the same political stalemate referred to by Mr. Sykes, thankfully, since we are basically free of governmental control we do not have that problem with which to deal. Private Religious education is far more subject, however, to parental pressure than governmental. Parents can exercise an absolute veto by withdrawing their children. If a sufficient withdraw from the school it would cease to exist at some point just following the curve of dimenishing returns. Or it would change in the direction desired by the parents. We accept this relationship because we believe that the Bible gives the parents the mandate to train the child in the way he should go and that God holds parents, not the Church and not the state, responsible for the fulfillment of this mandate.

Particularly, in Church schools, there's a definite leadership potential in determining the desired outcomes of Christian education because of our belief in the absolute authority of the scriptures the evangelical and fundamentalist church schools generally determine the philosophy, goals and outcomes of their church operated schools. Of the estimated ten to twelve thousand Christian schools nearly eight thousand of these are operated as integral ministries of a local church. Parents are typically told what the philosophy, goals, standards, religious training and expected outcomes will be prior to enrolling the child in the school. Thus, parents may pick or choose not to pick that school and its program based upon its match with their desired outcomes for their children.

Consequently, Church schools do not usually face the same problem of society forcing the curriculum upon the school as the public schools face according to Mr. Fenstermacher's remarks this morning. I sometimes wonder if it's society however, from my eight years in public education in Illinois and Michigan, if it's society so much that is forcing upon the curriculum as it is interest groups within the profession who would like to build up their own little kingdoms and dynasties. Rather, the philosophy, goals and outcomes tend to remain static in church schools and Christian schools in general in keeping with the absoluteness of the Biblical base from which the schools are operated. Methods, materials and some course offerings may change as they prove to enhance those goals and outcomes.

Now, we would agree with Mr. Fenstermacher, though I have the same question that one of the ladies on the Commission raised. In my notes, at the time that he and I talked then during the break and had some clarification there. But, we would agree, based on his clarification, with Mr. Fenstermacher that basic skills while crucial, ought not to be the sole concern of Christian education. National achievement test scores demonstrate that Christian schools are basically doing a good job in teaching basic skills.

Published statistics indicate that Christian school achievement test scores on reading and math are 8 to 13 months above the national norms across the boards at all grades.

Now, at the same time, however, several Christian school publishers have either developed their own readers, using character traits found in the Bible for each story, or have revived the McGuffy Readers in a more modern format. Now, in addition, serious attempts are being made throughout the curriculum material, and on the part of individual classroom teachers to present all factual knowledge in the light of, and in concert with, the teachings of scripture as it may reflect that particular denomination's views on the scriptures. Now, this gives the child then a -- an integrated christian world and light view, which we consider to be crucial. Values and ethics which have been increasingly left out, and someone mentioned this today, just in passing, that these have been increasingly left out of public education under the mistaken idea that values are, quote, "caught, but not taught". They are presented within the context of Christian education and inforced in the typical christian school.

Curricular materials, especially in reading, grammar, social sciences and Bible, combined with teacher freedom to use those golden moments to teach, and the relatively strict student conduct code all help to teach a biblical set of values and ethical behavior. A major concern creating permit within Christian education is the question of who shall be educated. Traditionally, Christian schools have tended to accept students who score in the upper three quarters on the national norms of a nationally standardized achievement test upon entry. Today more Christian schools find it a real problem of conscience to refuse those who score on that lower one fourth. Consequently, schools using the ACE, or Accelerated Christian Education curriculum, ACS, and other individualized instruction programs have moved to a policy of accepting all students and putting them in their proper entry level as shown by diagnostic testing. Schools using the traditional LOC step approach have begun developing tutorial programs to remediate students who could not otherwise be accepted because they simply could not keep up with the pace at which they would normally enter.

Only a few christian schools are currently in a position to deal with special education, learning disabled and gifted. We recognize the need and are seeking to encourage the education departments of Christian colleges and universities to establish such training components within their departments.

I was going to digress, at this point, to my prepared remarks, however, having heard our beep tone, I want to just pick up and let you read that. And, tell you what I think are some exciting things are -- that are happening in some of the Christian colleges in their programs. I think it bears on much of what's been said here today.

At Pensacola Christian College, and may I say that all of these schools have what would be called a lab school. Pensacola Christian is the largest christian school in the world, has three thousand students. They are the major publisher of christian school curriculum used in the evangelical and fundamentalist church schools in the United States. A freshman has six hours of observation. A sophmore, in addition to observaton, puts in time tutoring and does at least one five-minute mini-lesson during his sophmore year, or her sophmore year. As juniors they have observation, they have a two-week unit that they teach and an educational practicum in any school of their choice of forty-five hours during the inter-term, or post-term. Elementary education majors have eight methods courses during their junior year. All students are required to take a philosophy of discipline course, and then their senior year, they have sixteen weeks of directed teaching in addition to their seminars. I think a unique thing is eight weeks must be in -- for elementary people -- must be in the lower, or primary grades, and eight weeks in the upper elementary. In the high school, or secondary, eight weeks must be taught in their major and eight weeks in their minor so that they get a very strong teaching.

Two other schools very quickly. Bob Jones University, one of our previous speakers talked about NASDTEC, they are a member of that and their students have fifty hours at the sophmore level in lab school tutoring, observation, et cetera. They have additional fifteen hours plus peer teaching and peer teaching critique, a period of fifteen hours during that junior year and then nine weeks of directed teaching. Tennessee Temple follows pretty much the same format. They have one additional thing that I find exciting and that is all of their students are required to take a course in teaching the exceptional student. They are, perhaps, the farthest ahead within the christian school movement in this area.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

Our last speaker, before we take a break, will be Carolyn Huseman, who's a state Board member from the tenth Congressional district, Georgia.

MS. HUSEMAN: I was beginning to think I wasn't going to get a chance to testify. It feels good to stand up.

My name is Carolyn Huseman, I'm a member of the Georgia State Board of Education and Southern Area Director of the National Association of State Board's of Education. I am pleased this afternoon to have the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the National Association of State Board's

6

of Education which represents education policy making bodies in nearly all of the states, US trust territories and the District of Columbia. Our association shares your concern about the quality of America's teachers and wants to commend the member of the Commission for focusing national attention on this issue.

Although a state and a local responsibility, the quality of America's teachers is unquestionably a national concern. Effective teaching has profound effects on the nation's economy, on its national security and on the variability of our citizens to participate effectively in the democratic process. It is to the credit of the Commission that its members have taken positive steps in making quality teacher education a national issue and a national priority. We strongly believe it is time to move beyond rhetoric to possible steps toward a solution.

My written testimony details what is happening in several states in this region. Let me give you a quick update on my own state, Georgia.

Ten years ago, in 1972, Georgia became concerned about the certification process of teachers, leadership and service personnel. A statewide task force was established and in 1975 the State Board of Education adopted policies on performance based certification that implemented the recommendations of the task force and established guidelines for the State Department of Education and teacher education colleges. Requirements for teacher certification included, first, completion of an approved program in education at an accredit college or university. Second, obtainment of a passing score on a criteria referenced test in the appropriate teacher, leadership, or service field. And, third, achievement of satisfactory grading in fourteen performance competencies to be assessed by trained evaluators during the first three years of actual employment.

Similar activities are happening in other states. We wish to recommend to the Commission a mechanism for considering and evaluating the broad range of factors involved in the recruitment in education, certification and professional development of quality teachers. We have argued that a variety of experiences responding to issues of quality and competence currently exist in our individual states. Therefore, we recommend that priority be given to a national coordination and upgrading already existing staff, university and local efforts. We believe the most effective vehicle for this coordination role would be a national agency with; one, a broad state level constituency; two, credibility in the types of dissemination and technical assistance necessary to accomplish and the evaluation of efforts to create teaching excellence; and three, administrative mechanisms already in place for national and regional conferences to give national exposure to excellence in practice and to allow states with similar problems and evolving solutions to share and coordinate efforts.

Such an agency could coordinate these efforts with the national government to insure that national purposes are met. We believe that this approach responds to the Commission's and the nation's priority to insure teacher competence and encourage teacher excellence in a non-duplicative matter that builds on existing expertise.

We commend you, again, for addressing and taking action on this critical issue, and for the opportunity to represent the position of the state's education policy makers.

We are ready to work further with the Commission in the task of encouraging and upgrading the level of teacher quality in our nation. There is no task more central to this nation's future.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you Carolyn, thank you very much.

I think we are right on schedule, at 3 o'clock, and we will take a ten minute break and be back for the discussion.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

COMMISSIONER KIRK: The Commission has attempted in it's deliberations to provide an opportunity for all viewpoints to be heard. We have especially encouraged the most vocal critics of the existing education system to present information to us. Gene Lyonns; critic, journalist, and author of "Why Teachers Can't Teach"; was to have been a witness today to serve as a discussant for our afternoon session. Unfortunately, a last minute problem has prevented his appearance. We're very sorry that he can't be here. I'm sure all of you are too because he would have provided a lively stimulation for all of us, but we will try to do that in his absence. In his place we have also asked Gary Sykes and Sam Yarger to provide a brief synthesis and analysis of the afternoon testimony. Gene Lyonns formal remarks will be inserted in the hearing record. And remember the record will be opened until June 12th, so you may submit anything up until that point.

May we now please have Sam Yarger.

MR. YARGER: I didn't know I was going to have the opportunity to do this, so all I can do is respond to what I have heard because some of the papers that were presented I did not have access to prior to this afternoon. I also think it's fitting for those of you who have read Gene Lyonns that I get the chance to stand in his place. That's ironical, being as I'm a member of one of the types of institutions that he's so critical of in his writing.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: See what happens if you don't show up.

MR. YARGER: And he's been very (Indistinguishable) teacher training students to the major problems in American schools and I'm here to say that it's really generous.

I also thought about the task involved in synthesizing what I heard today and decided if, in fact, there is someone in this room who can synthesize what we heard today I would appreciate it if they would raise their hand and replace me up here because it's not material that can be synthesized. Rather I'm going to tell you what I heard or what I think I heard. What I think some of the important themes are that I heard and try and keep myself from making too many commentaries concerning those themes.

I did hear, improve the work space and make jobs more satisfying for teachers. I think that's a very important theme. One that shouldn't be dismissed or taken lightly. I did or would hestitate to -- to push it quite too strongly. I think that what we have to do is make the work space more satisfying, the jobs more satisfying. I think you do some of that by being better at what you're doing than you were before. It's a notion called "competence motivation" that Robert White put forth many years ago. It kinda says that Gordy Hall becames a hockey player, a national hockey player, because he discovered he was good at hockey. He didn't get interested in hockey and then develop those skills. People who are better at what they do than others or better in what they do than they use to be, tend to enjoy the work space more. I think the two interelate on the teacher education and the whole organizational improvement ideas could stand to learn a lot from each other.

I heard about the need for more teacher involvement and more teacher control. And I think that that is -- on the former, I think it's important; on the latter, I think it's a political distinction and discussion that's going to be going on for some time. There is clearly a need for client development, for teacher involvement particularly when you're talking about teacher education. The control issue is one that -- that goes beyond all of us, I think, at this particular fort, I think relates to political positions.

I heard of the need for Teacher Centers for inservice education. Having worked with Teaher Centers for the last four years quite closely, as a matter of fact, having gathered data on them, I've viewed them as one of the fresh lights in American teacher education. I don't think, however, they are the form, or the structure that are going to solve our staff development inservice problems. I think they are part of the answer but not the entire answer.

I heard some conflicting news too. I heard that the Liberal Arts backgound is what's needed to become a good teacher, and I also heard that the Liberal Arts backgound is not enough. Being as I represent personally an institution of higher education and a school of education, I obviously think that they're both important points of view and I do think the Liberal Arts background is important to people becoming teachers. I clearly do think there's more to it than that.

I heard a plea for one to three year internships. That's an idea that is not new to teacher education. It's been here a long time, and I think it could be worked out. It was proposed in my state in New York last year, two years ago, but politics killed any hope that it might be implemented. And I think that the notion of an internship with people, or truly master teachers, and with the support such as is being explored in Oklahoma at this time, does make a good deal of sense and it's something that we could all learn from.

I heard of the need for continuing federal support in education. I won't comment on that need except it's nothing that I'm going to go home and start counting on in the next few weeks.

I heard for coordination between states and I heard that states in fact are the key places to improve the learning of children and the training of teachers. I think that the state has a role to play. They always have had a role to play, and I think the economy to be derived from states working together would make a whole lot of sense.

I heard about the need for what I would call more behavioristic teacher education and I heard the need for what I would call more humanistic teacher education. I think, probably, there is merit to both positions in that I don't think we know enough about the training of teachers or the learning of students to translate our programs into -- into rigid behavioristic type things. Yet we do know enough about the skills that are related to children's learning that much of our program can be -- can be skill learning. As an administrator and educator, I always assumed a belief in teachers.

One of the things that I enjoyed most, in fact I became envious of, was one of our last speakers. The refreshing autonomy of the Christian Schools accountable to the parents and to their beliefs. That's something that if you work at public education long enough you do come to respect and admire it, if not envy.

My commentary which is just what I thought about it all. I thought that I heard a lot of organizations described that I already knew existed. I thought I heard ~~a~~ positions laid in front of me that I already knew existed.

And I thought I heard some ideologies presented I already knew existed. What I would like us to come up with somehow is a -- is a form for dealing with the problems that we're talking about. A form for getting information. A form for discussing delivering those things and with reason. A form for finding and seeking wisdom wherever it might be. And I would suggest it's not going to be concluded in 18 months. And I wish the Council well and hope that they can leave us with something that's important.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

Gary Sykes.

MR. SYKES: In some ways the fundamental question today that we haven't really come at directly is, just how -- how do we go about improving the quality of teaching. And much of it is focused on the teacher as the locus of good quality teaching. Using terms like talent pool, and recruitment, and so on. The notion being that we have to get -- we've got to get good people into the classrooms and we have to hold them there. Along with it we have to provide a good professional education for teachers. I thought though that there were -- there was a heavy emphasis on one of approach to treating both of those matters and, of course, finding minor emphasis on a complementary approach and I was very struck by that.

Let -- let me characterize the approach that seemed to attract the most attention as a regulatory one. Much of the testimony today was filled with terms like regulation, standards, quality control, tests, criteria. All -- a whole -- a whole set of terms that implied that we can materially effect the quality of teaching through some kind of super structure outside of the schools that adheres in such things as state law, guidelines, regulations, tests, and so on. And there was a great deal of discourse today on those subjects. I wonder -- I really wonder just how significant a regulatory approach is likely to be to improving the quality of teaching. The --the minor note that received somewhat less attention focused on such things as support for teachers. The norms that govern the working conditions for teachers. Given that, for example, so many teachers seem to work in isolation and that this is so particularly damaging to a beginning teacher who really desperately needs help in that first year and yet in so many schools the norm seems to be, "Thou shall not enter another teacher's classroom for any reason." How could we effect the relations in the workplace. Well, my -- my sense is that those sorts of issues have a great deal more to do with teaching effectiveness than with regulation of teaching by policy makers at any level in the system. And that -- and that in some ways we need to balance a concern for a regulation with a concern for quality of worklife. And with the connection between the quality of worklife in schools and the outcomes of school -- of schooling for students, my belief though is that quality of worklife for teachers and quality of education for students are inextricably related to one another. That is to say to the extent that teachers are intellectually challenged on the job, have warm satisfying challenging and exciting relationships in their work with their students, with their colleagues, with their administrative superiors. To that extent student learning will be enhanced. And that's the locus for the improvement of teaching. This isn't to gainsay that we do have to pay attention to such matters as recruitment in centers. I don't mean to say that a matter like teacher salary isn't terrible important. And there is a kind of moral quality to calling for increases in teacher salaries that's independent of the more hardheaded considerations about how salaries tend to get determined by labor market conditions. There is just a general feeling that teaching is a noble calling that ought to be adequately rewarded in our society. And that in some ways the balance of rewards just isn't there the way it used to be. I don't know if there's any data that you could marshall to make the point, but there is a kind of pervasive sense that's not simply an expression of self interest that that's the case. And I think that's an important perspective.

But I just want to close by saying. Quality of worklife in individual schools is absolutely critical to effective teaching. And there are a lots of specifics around that, but we shouldn't lose sight of that in our interest in state level policy certification and some of these other concerns that -- that in some ways preoccupied the hearing today.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, Gary.

Now I would like to open this up to questions by the Commissioners and if any of our presenters would also like to ask questions, we welcome them. Do we have a first question?

MR. FOSTER: Madam Chairman.

I'd like to ask the Superintendent from Jackson, Mississippi a question. To amplify his statement on the second page -- in Jackson this year we implemented a formula that puts performance on equal footing with seniority in the staff reduction decisions. Was that a difficult assignment or is that something that you can describe more fully for us to our benefit?

MR. FORTENBERRY: It would require more time for thorough understanding than we can give here, but let me give you a brief overview of it. About five years ago we went to a very rigorous screening program to screen in applicants, job applicants -- National Teacher Examination, written tests, various interviews. And we began to select some very outstanding young people to be our incoming teachers. When you cut people based on seniority alone, during RIF, we found ourselves cutting out some of our very best people. Based on that concept we set about to change the way we reduce the staff in times of staff reduction, the way we evaluate people. We put together, we have a system called Shared Governants which is made up of teachers, administrators, parents. They help us arrive at policy decisions. We put together a Shared Governants group and formulated a policy for -- for staff evaluation based on performance, seniority, certification, and staff development. In the beginning year, as this year, it's a 100 point scale. Performance counts 40 points, seniority counts 40 points, staff development counts 5 points, and degrees counts 15 points. A total of 100 points, maximum 100 points. We're moving to increasing the performance to 60 points over a four year period of time. We reduce the staff by 90 people this year, and we have at the present time seven court cases over that. But I think it is essential that we move in that direction because there is a difference in the performance of superintendents, and principals, teachers, and if you were to ask the parents they could give you a pretty good indication of what the difference is. We just need to put it in some kind of scientific setting. We're struggling through that at the present time. the present time.

MR. FOSTER: Has this been written up anywhere?

MR. FORTENBERRY: Yes, it is written up.

MR. FOSTER: Is it possible for the Commission to get a copy of that?

MR. FORTENBERRY: Yes, indeed.

MR. FOSTER: Thank you, sir.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Margaret.

MS. MARSTON: Doctor Fortenberry, in carrying on from Mr. Foster's comments on page 3 in the center of the page you quote "at present school systems have virtually no input into who was qualified to teach. Teachers are trained by universities, they are licensed by the state, they come to the school districts with a seal of approval that reveals nothing of their aptitudes and ability, and they are released from contract and they remain licensed teachers. But indeed you have, from your discussion with Mr. Foster, have had input into that, so I'm having . . .

MR. FORTENBERRY: We've had some input in selection from among those that are applying. But competency is a thing that is legally established by the university and by the state, not by the Jackson School District or any other school district that I know. Now we select from those that are declared to be competent, we do not make them competent.

MS. MARSTON: Do you think your approach to evaluating teachers will have some effect in Mississippi at the state level?

MR. FORTENBERRY: It was not designed to do that.

I -- it was designed to give us, hopefully, a better teaching staff, a better administrative staff, in the Jackson public schools. Whatever influence it has, that's something that we do not control.

MS. MARSTON: Very tactfully answered. Thank you.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Thank you.

MR. CROSBY: While we're on the superintendent . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Mr. Crosby.

MR. CROSBY: . . . coming back to the performance, do you have built in -- well, what do you have built in as a mechanism to measure that performance before you get to the RIFing process?

MR. FORTENBERRY: There are -- there is -- there is a formalized process of observable behaviors that a supervisor has to make, in relation to teachers it's based on classroom observations. I would be less than -- it would be less than honest to say though that there is not, at some point, that professional judgment has to enter into that. We accept the position that part of managements responsibility is to evaluate and part of evaluation is professional judgment.

MR. CROSBY: Okay. Now, to follow on that same one. Since you do have a formal observation procedure and you still got your 100 point system, how much does this observation measure into reaching that 100 percent . . .

MR. FORTENBERRY: This year . . .

MR. CROSBY: You said you had Shared Governors, I want . . .

MR. FORTENBERRY: This year 40 percent of 100 points, a maximum of 40 percent of the 100 points. It will eventually reach 60 points of the 100 over a four year period.

MR. CROSBY: Now is that more than one person involved in that observation process?

MR. FORTENBERRY: At the built in level it can either be a principal or a vice principal. And of course there is the right of a built in state law in our policy too. There is the right of due process.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I would like to ask Mr. Fortenberry a question too. As we go about the country on these hearings it becomes increasingly evident to us that all of the administrations, and the principals, the superintendents, and such, seem to be putting into effect some kind of an adaptation of a management by objectives -- type of thing, now is -- a system. Is that true in your case and if so, were you influenced by the business world? Were you influenced by the public? Is this just something that is in your professional journals? It has hit us very clearly that it seems to be that the educators are now borrowing from the business world and saying, all right, we have angle plans, we have effective -- this is the way to get effective teachers, other product, the client, you know. This is all the new -- the new terms.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Okay. Let me say one additional thing about performance. If you followed the last Gallop Poll, in the last Gallop Poll 70 percent of the American people indicated that they thought that performance should enter into thr RIFing. And another very striking feature in that particular report was only two percent of the American people who had their children in public schools had no opinion on that particular question.

Now back to your -- the other question about management by objectives. I -- there's no question that the schools of business and the business world has had some impact [illegible] school management. I don't think there is any question that that is the case. We try to operate the school system based on some objective -- some objective base and we try to do the same thing in curriculum. One of the things about effective schools, that's coming out of effective school research is, children will learn more in those schools where there's a very clear indication of what is expected of the teacher to teach. That is very clear. Ron Edmonds and Bach Rosenshine and others have clearly indicated those data in their research. Also, from a superintendent's standpoint,

-- I have an annual evaluation with the Board of Education and that evaluation is based upon some agreed upon objections each year. I want them to -- I want to know the things around which I'm being judged. And we need to mutually, the Board and I need to mutually agree upon a set of objectives. That clear -- that clarifies the things around which we are to be evaluated. Schools of business and the business world has had some impact, there's no question that that is the case. There are some intangibles that make it somewhat difficult in education. To pursue that to the nth degree but nevertheless, I think it's a good approach.

MS. LARSEN: Contrasting today's session with yesterdays and for any of you who do not know, we were out visiting schools yesterday. We went to Douglas High School and May High School here in Atlanta. We saw the smiling faces of children. We saw the smiling faces of a lot of staff members, great exuberance and I would say we ended yesterday's visitations with really uplifting feelings. Today we've had some testimony that is extremely challenging. Some of it, somewhat, defensive. Perhaps a lot of it, somewhat, depressing. I think about the only joy that we've had today contrasted with the joy yesterday is our -- the delight of our kindergarten teacher and the freshness that she had and the work ethic that she seem to experience in her job, and the gentleman representing the Christian Schools who was out from under all the regulations that all of the public entities have. And I think in looking at the end of the page of Doctor Fortenberry's testimony, education for too long has provided a professional nesting ground for mediocrity. It's something that really has become a challenge of this Commission. And as we look at Doctor MacColl's points and the things that will develop teacher satisfaction and school effectiveness and a good school site and recalling it to the testimony of both Kathy Jones and Mary Lou Romaine, the question of variable salary scales is again before us. What is your feeling on that, Kathy, as far as revitalizing teachers that might be somewhat less than your four (Indistinguishable) burned out or whatever. Would giving incentive pay or merit pay be a plus or a minus as far as you're concerned.

MS. JONES: There's a good deal of controversy among educators about that point. I think if we lived in Utopia, merit pay would be a good thing. And I have to answer this somewhat personally from my ten years of teaching experience. I have yet to find a good way in which to measure the basis of merit. I find that more times than not the teacher who can polish the apple the best will get the merit pay. And it may not mean that the best job has been done. I often find that merit either causes teachers not to be able to speak out about the things that they need to be improved, or that if they do then they are not considered often, you know, times for a merit. I do think it's very important that good teaching be rewarded, but there are a number of other ways that it can be. I think that if a teacher is not doing a good job then the teacher does not belong in a classroom. And as long as they are kept there they deserve the money. And it should be comparable to other professions in our society since education is the very basis and I consider the children of this nation to be the best resource for our country.

MS. LARSEN: So you would think that the mediocre or less substandard teacher should be cancelled out of the system?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: What about grievances?

MS. JONES: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER KIRK: What about the problem of grievances and, you know, what the Unions have provided for these teachers. Sometimes, as you know, being honest, it means that no one will let them get out of the system because they do not want to go to Court. They do not want this problem. I realize that the organization that you're representing, but I wondered if you would answer this in a personal way.

MS. JONES: Well, I think we all have our tasks to perform in the educational structure. And there is an evaluation process of teachers. If that is done properly and if records are kept and if they are evaluated in a number of different ways then there is no problem in determining whether a teacher is doing a competent job or not. And if you read the tenure laws of most of our states, they don't guarantee that a teacher will be kept in the classroom forever unless that teacher is doing a good job. And so I think if all levels, the administration, and so forth, do what's suppose to be done that that will not be a problem.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I have one question that I would like to ask any member of the presenting panel who would like to answer this. It seems as though, with all of the problems with teacher certification, with the quality of schools, that if -- and this has just been a suggestion by a number of people -- if there were some kind of a test -- testing abilities at different levels, for instance that by the time you finished third grade you should be able to read to this capacity. By the time you finish six grade you should be able -- an eighth, and tenth, you know, you could decide the cut off points. If there were some kind of a test it doesn't have to be a national test. It doesn't have to fit a -- a respective group of tests, the California Achievement Test, something of this nature that was established. Would this in effect over a period of time show whether or not the teacher could cut the mustard. I don't mean a first teacher, a first year teacher, a provisional licensed teacher. I mean over a period of, say, three years, again depending on the levels of the children in the classes. For instance, that given that there will be variables, that there will be different level ability, but given all of that, that over a period of time that if the teacher consistently did not have students who passed some kind of -- I don't want to call it competency because that invisions all kind of other problems, but I mean some kind of basic skills that they can read at this level, or they can -- should they be pushed on, you know, from grade -- one grade to the next. It seems as though that would be some way to measure. I mean we have to have a base. We have to say that when they get out of kindergarten they know the ABC's. That they have to know how to count from this -- you know, I mean, every kindergarten teacher knows that so by the time they finish eighth grade or such they should have this amount of knowledge. Now if we could agree on that, would this not help all the Departments of Educations, all the superintendents? It many be a simplistic view. And I'm also wondering about the Christian Schools. Would this -- they are now in Court battling states for their certification. And one of the Court cases in Michigan, I know, that they entered into the record the California Achievement Test of these school which were considerably higher than the public schools. And yet, it was said that the -- their teachers were not competent. Now what in the final analysis is competency?

MS. MacCOLL: Let me make a couple of comments on that. Experts on testing will be the first ones to tell you not to rely on testing for major decisions. Okay. In terms of evaluating teacher performance, generally, the recommendation is that tests provide one form of information. But the test results are not wholly dependent on what the teacher has done with the children during the year. There are many other things that enter into that teacher's ability to work well with these particular students which may be taken -- have to be taken into account. I was struck by the statement that only the upper 75 percent of children are admitted into the Christian Schools. Well, if you teach a class which only admits the upper 75 percent then, you know, probably you're going to get more achievement than if you had a class which is concentrated from the bottom or whatever. There are a lot of problems with that. You need a combination of evidence. Some based on observation of the teacher's work and what the teacher does. That no one single basis is enough. And that I think that -- that Doctor Fortenberry is right in leaving room for an element of professional judgment. The major article that I reviewed that talks about testing as a means of selecting employees makes the remark and I think, not just a jocular fashion, that for all the sophistication, et cetera, et cetera, of tests which has grown up in the modern age where for productivity is less than it was in the old days when hiring was based on the foreman's good judgment of who was or was not a good worker. And I think that's something to keep in mind.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Doctor Fortenberry and then we will have Mr. Lowden.

MR. FORTENBERRY: I would join her in part of that opinion to some degree. To some degree there is a higher level of achievement based on selected enrollment.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I -- I really would like to redirect this question.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Leave out what I said about the Christian Schools if you like, okay, because otherwise we'll get into a controversy about the Christian Schools.

MR. FORTENBERRY: If -- if we're going to have things on the record. I wanted that statement in the record though.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Fine. But I mean just answer, perhaps address yourself to the question about public schools.

MR. FORTENBERRY: Okay, fine. I think tests -- you must consider performance of students. There must be some way to measure that performance against expectations. We have not yet perfected very good the measures of expectations. What should be achieved. And we're moving in that direction some more. There are some systems around the country, and we're moving in this direction, where over a long period of time you can collect enough data at least to ask some questions. Why students in one classroom of similar backgrounds are progressing faster than students in another back -- or students in another classroom. There are some things that are emerging. It takes a fairly sophisticated data processing approach to be able to manage those data. But I think that is the direction in which we are moving, and I think that is a very legitimate way of evaluating what we're all doing. Now it's not just the evaluation of the teacher. The evaluation of the school, the leadership in the school, the leadership in the system, the amount of resources that are provided; that also must enter into it. But it -- it is in my judgment a very important approach and one which cannot be neglected because the people are looking to us to provide student learning and we must ask questions about whether that is or is not taking place and why it is or is not taking place.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Yes, sir.

MR. LOWDEN: I'd like to observe two things. Number one, so that it's clear to all of the other presenters. I did indicate that while that had been the pattern that that pattern is changing and we have, for example, used the oldest line in mental maturity's test to ascertain since some of my friends are in the public school sector in Alabama had thrown out the challenge that we had the cream of the crop. And we found, for example, the second grade level that our students mean scores were 101. One hundred being the center of the scale. And at the ninth grade level there was a slight askewing to about 107 which we would have to do some longitudinal studies to determine whether it's the program itself that was causing the scale to increase or if there was some selectivity factor there. The second thing is in my printed testimoy I quote Donald Medley at the University of Virginia in an article. And I think this is something that maybe has been made fuzzy here today. I think he gives us some useful distinctives there between teacher competency which he defines as any single knowledge, skill, or professional value position which the teacher may be said to possess or not possess. And the possession of which you believe to be relevant to the successful practice of teaching versus teacher competence which is defined in terms of that persons repertoire. How confident a teacher is depends on the repertoire of competencies that he or she possesses. Then he makes a further distinction then in performance which refers to what the teacher does on the job. I've seen people with Phi Beta Kappa Keys hanging on their vest who couldn't teach their way out of a paper bag and communicate anything to students and nothing was happening in that classroom. And then lastly he talks about teacher effectiveness which is the title of today's hearing which he says refers to the effect that the teacher's performance has on pupils and that this is the bottom line in education. They either can or they can't read when they get out of third grade and the teacher ought to be judged on the basis -- the cumulative teachers first are K-3 in that one skill area.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you. We'll have -- I think we'll have you first and then Margaret.

MS. JONES: I am a reading specialist and I just have to make a couple of remarks. You've got to realize that by the end of third grade some students are not going to be able to read and they mature at greatly different rates. I have worked personally with children who could not read much at all until they were nine or ten years old. And then I've seen them take off and become superb readers. And I would never want that child to be judged, you knew, by a certain standard and then have that not happen as a result of that judgment. I also would not have the teacher judged a poor teacher because that was happening. Because you can do -- you can do everything in the world for that child and if he is not ready or if he does not have that capability then he cannot do it.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Margaret.

MS. MARSTON: I was very, very interested in Mr.

Loveday's figures, 92,000 youngsters in the state of Georgia in private schools which is almost the size of public education in the state of Delaware. And we have come today to talk about teachers and teacher education, and I would be very interested for both Mr. Loveday and Mr. Lowden if you could very briefly explain to us how you, in the private sector, evaluate teachers and when you find that one of them is not acceptable how difficult it is to remove them from the classroom. Are you experiencing, really, some of the same problems that we're experiencing?

MR. LOVEDAY: I think that some of the same problems, yes. And as I pointed out in my remarks the responsibility as we see it lies with the head of the school. And I think in most of the private schools when the head of the school determines that a teacher is not producing, he politely asks this teacher to go somewhere else. It's just -- just that simple.

MR. LOWDEN: I think in the church schools which I'm associated with, the pattern would be first since we view them as being co-laborers in the ministry, therefore, our approach would be one of seeking to work with them in every possible way to help them over any rough spots. It would not be so much a superior subordinate kind of relationship as a co-laborer type of relationship. However, if there came a point where evaluation seem to indicate that perhaps they were like the fellow who was plowing in the field and saw the sky-writer print PC and thought that meant go preach Christ and so he went and enrolled in a semimary and found out later that it meant plow corn. We may have to tell them at that point that we think they sincerely need to plow corn and not teach children any longer. Normally, very seldom is there a lawsuit because we try to provide guidelines for our schools. How to handle it in a proper way and keep adequate records so that these counseling sessions and what they have done to try to help this person to become a good teacher and have failed. Generally, they will, you know, see the wisdom in the matter.

MS. MARSTON: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you all very much. This has been very enlightening, very exciting. We're going to -- sorry . . .

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, I need to change my tape.

(A brief pause while Reporter changed tapes.)

COURT REPORTER: We're on the record.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Okay. I'm going to conclude with a remark by Bunny Smith, some of you will all be familiar with Bunny Smith, an educator of reknown. And, he says that;

"Our professional organizations,

> whatever their differences, must now dedicate themselves cooperatively to the cause of public education as it is reflected in the colleges that prepare those who are to be the models, companions, guides, and instructors of our children and youth for almost a quarter of their lifetimes. Now is the time, both the public, and state governments are in the mood to act constructively, but they are floundering, they need leadership from the profession. If the leadership cannot put itself in order the constructive mood of legislative bodies will evaporate. It is not unlikely that a decade of punitive legislation will then be ushered in and the chances for a significant advancement of teaching as a profession will have been lost for at least a generation."

So the Commission's commission is to act as a place where we can dialogue. Perhaps, we can bring these problems to the suface and realize the depth of the problem and get together on the solution and cooperate in that solution. We must act together because this is just such an extremely thing we're about. Because, we have debated for a long time "what are the ends of education", and we can go on forever saying, "you can't say what ends we have", but -- "and different schools will have different ends". But, it seems that ultimately those ends, over the centuries, have always been the impartation to the young of wisdom and virtue.

We will now break into two groups. There will be one here (indicating), one group here, and the -- the people in this room will be Mary Ramzer; Eugene Kelly, Jr.; Richard Hodges; James Grey; Robert Dickson; Pat Woodall; Apply Morgan; Wayne Wheatley; Robert Fonteneau. And, the following witnesses will be heard in the order listed in -- in this order, at the Max Cooba room; William Drummond; Debbie Yohoe; Eunice Simms, and Donald Galler; James Collins, Ann Levie Bill Katzenmeyer; William Walter Mike, and Joe Hassenstaff.

We will . . .

MS. YOHOE: With due respect, since we're on the record, that's Debbie Yohoe, with a "y". Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: It's a "Y", that's the printing of our staff member. We'll take punitive measures.

The presentors mav sit at the table over here, it's musical chairs so quickly get a seat.

(Pause while seating arrangements are completed.)

COMMISSIONER KIRK: You may make your presentations sitting at the table or, if you'd like, you may use the podium, either way it's fine with us. You'll be allowed five minutes and we have this little beeper, I think you've already heard that.

MR. FORTNER: I'm afraid the beeper's going to sound like this (indicating).

COMMISSIONER KIRK: The beeper's going to sound like that. Right. He'll probably just put his hand up.

Why don't you do that.

MR. FORTNER: I'll try it.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I had understood it was seven minutes, it's five.

MR. FORTNER: It's five to seven minutes. I'm going to hold my hand up at five which means you've got two more minutes.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thanks for telling me that, he told me five.

MR. FORTNER: About five to seven minutes.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Okay. Robert Fonteneau was down on the list but he's supposed to be leaving on a plan so we're going to let him have his five to seven minutes right now.

Would you identify yourself for the record.

MR. FONTENEAU: Thank you very much. I'm Robert Fonteneau, I'm an Educational Psychologist and Professor of Education, and Director of the Bilingual Center at the University of Southwestern Louisiana at LaFayette.

The issue today is that an educational problem prevention model should be initiated in education as part of our national educational policy for excellence, and as part of the new literacy for century 21. The position that this testimony will seek to advance's an advocacy position for the establishment and implementation of an educational problem prevention approach in grades K through 3, which should be initiated as a matter of national educational policy in public schools. The rationale, more than 50% of students enrolling in colleges and universities read at or below the 8 grade level. These are the results reported by a special task force appointed by the Louisiana School Board of Regents to study the achievement level of college-bound students.

The results proclaim an urgent call to develop and implement an educational program of problem prevention in the elementary public schools in this country. We must establish an educational policy that translates in the classroom into learning and teaching programs of problem prevention. The citizenry of this nation want, pay for, and expect an educational program that prevents educational problems rather than the establishment of remedial programs that attempt to remedy educational problems, which never should have arisen in the first place. Also, remedial educational programs imply that the tax payers of this nation should subsidize failed, ineffective educational approaches and incompetent educational policies.

The educational system of the United States, once the envy of the world, has fallen apart at the seams. As we note that the 3-r's and language studies have been neglected, school achievement has plummeted, and discipline has risen astronomically until now we are presenting worthless high school diplomas to a generation of unemployables. Clearly, you're asking, "What is the cause of this?". Certainly, it is the educational policy of the last two decades that can account for this miserable record. But, the educational policies of the last 20 years has not been made in the classrooms, or in the schoolboard rooms, or in the superintendent's rooms. Rather, the educational policies of the last 20 years have been made in the courtrooms, in the political backrooms, and in the corporate boardrooms of American business and industry. The policy of education for the last two decades in this country has been made by self-appointed geniuses in politics, in government, in business, labor, industry, and the Federal Judiciary. Small wonder children cannot read, and write, and spell, and cipher, and think critically.

The school's mission historically, educationally, and professionally is a place to teach, and a place to learn. That is the original debt of the school. The Federal Judiciary has effectively destroyed that mission. The truth suggests that the classroom teacher, the Principal, the supervisor and district superintendent, and the Chief State School Officer have very little to say in creating and implementing school policies, yet they are the ones who receive all the blame for the ails and shortcomings of education.

Educational problems will never be solved by political solutions. Educational problems demand educational solutions. If we are serious about the improvement of education in America we must acknowledge the truth, that attempted political solutions of past and present educational problems simply compound the problems we are attempting to solve.

I should like to introduce a program of educational problem prevention to this national commission on Excellence in Education. First, this educational program of prevention would have the following features;

One; only the very best teachers should be assigned to K through 3 in the public schools as the beginning years of school learning are the most important and critical.

You're asking, "well, who are these most effective teachers?". Clearly the most effective teachers have competences in skills that I didn't hear today, nor do I know if there are imported in our schools of education in this country. There are four in nature; One, a teacher has competence in learning, a master of learning theories; second, they have -- they're masters of child development and human development; third, they know principles of teaching; fourth, they have mastery of subject matter and they can equate the learner with the learning. I cannot conceive of educators in the business of teaching and learning that don't know anything about child development, or learning theories. Every physician I know knows something about diagnostician. He's a good diagnostician, he knows the symptomotology and the body and how it functions. The same thing should be asked of a teacher, I should think.

Second; the educational curricula for grades K-3 should deal exclusively with language development, reading, spelling, writing, arithmetic, computation and critical thinking.

Third; K-3 pupils will attain established standards of educational competence.

Fourth; teachers in grades K through 3 will be given time to teach and pupils will be given time to learn.

And fifth; appropriate class sizes for effective teaching and learning should be established.

The beginning school years of Kindergarten through grade 3 are critical in establishing positive patterns of school learning and skill acquisitions. The ed -- this educational truth demands that we appoint the very best teachers in Kindergarten and in grades one, two and three. The curricula for those beginnning years must emphasize language development. Language is a tool and a medium upon which all other learning rests, including the development of intelligence. Children in grade K through 3 should be helped in developing critical thinking skills. Maybe they can solve our budget problems, or solve the "Falkan" problem.

Can we return to schools their proper mission as a place to teach and a place to learn? Can we return to education to those who are mostly responsible for its management, that is, the teachers, the supervisors, principals, superintendents, local school boards, and the Chief State School Officers. Can we return to schools an environment where teachers are free to teach, free from fear, and intimidation, and assault, and battery, and murder, and rape. Can we return to schools an environment where children are free to learn, free from intimidation, and assault, and battery, and money shakedown, and drugs, and alcohol, and murder, and rape. Can we return to schools this proper mission or must we redefine the school's mission today. Perhaps this counsel should like to consider a definition of the school's mission today. Frankly, I am at a loss to determine its mission.

The answers to these eminent problems will not be found in the back of the book, but rather, will be found in the back of the head. I should thank -- like to thank the Commission for this opportunity.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, very much. Very good.

We will now have Mary Ramzer, who is a teacher from Camden, South Carolina, but I think that probably only tells half of what you do. Now, tell us the rest.

MS. RAMZER: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be here. And, as a Public School Teacher, I am grateful for your concern with the problems of education as you have addressed them here today. In 1962, my sister, Mary Lindsey -- my name's Nancy, by the way -- and I are both teachers in public high school and terribly concerned and frustrated. We realized that teachers, those closest to the problems could and should come up with the answers to the educational ills. We designed a system of education which has since been named the "Ramzer Pilotlight System". It was implemented in Camden High School in 1963 and since that time it has been put into practice in all subject areas and in grades 4 through 12.

A few of its features are the following, it's simple in design and it doesn't cost a dime, as a taxpayer that pleases me. It demands much of the teacher but it does not dictate to him. It creates no scheduling problems, in fact, it tends to eliminate those problems. It has a ranking system that gives an accurate picture of student achievement. Built into the RLP plan, as we call it, is a teacher evaluation system that is fair and accurate. As we say, under this system, good teachers get justice, indifferent teachers get their just deserts. Most importantly, it under -- it individualizes instruction in a realistic way. Students are not separated into different classes based on achievement scores or prior grades. We don't feel we can depend upon them. In an RPL class you will find children of varied back grounds, social and intellectual. Under the RPL system three levels of work are established for most courses. Group one is the excellerated level requiring writing skills and a high level of learning skills.

Group two requires the students having a good foundation in grammar since he will be trained to write for different subject areas. Under RPL it -- Excuse me. Under RPL, the English language is not viewed as a peculiarity of English teachers. Students in this group are graded on writing as well as on subject content, be it math, physical ed, or whatever.

Group three contains subject studies but does not require writing skills in courses other than English. A student who desires, and is capable of doing one and two, in history or math, is inspired to learn the skills of grammar in his English course. Group three also measures competency. A student who cannot pass at group three level obviously is not competent in that subject. The distinctions are made through tests, individual research, and independent study, but students are not stereotyped as advanced or slow. They are never pointed out as belonging to any group by seating arrangements, labels, et cetera. The student chooses the group in which he will do his work and he is free to move after each reporting period. He does not have to follow any particular pattern. He can by-pass a group in any direction. Just as a student is free to choose his group, he is free to choose his course grade from any of the groups in which he has worked. The teacher counsels with each child at the end of reporting periods. He may advise a student to make a move, but only the student can make the decision to move. No one has misplaced him, no one has labeled him or directed to draw attention to his weaknesses, nor is the student penalized for an ambitious try. He is encouraged to beat the challenge.

The student is involved in all phases of his academic profile. He, by his free choice of group, judges his potential, grades his own effort, decides what his goals are and accomplishes as much as he chooses within them. This system was conceived to lay the foundation for a promising tomorrow. What it does, above all, is to respect the child. This is the essence of it, by thrusting on him responsibility for his success and -- successes and failures thus not only building into his character self-respect but teaching him to earn now what he will need for his future.

Mary and I wrote a book "Where To Find Tomorrow", which was published by Regnery-Gateway. And, in the book we discussed the system in detail. But, we tackle other problems because just a system of teaching or grading is not enough, it must be ingrained in the entire system. We discuss very serious things, such as, teacher training, the discipline I just heard about, which is wrecking our schools, parent role, the student of today who's considerably different from the one yesterday, and many of the topics that you've discussed here today. We present the causes for these problems that are wrecking the schools and we advance solutions. Now, I've said that Mary and I've done all this, please understand one thing. I never was much for this modern generation of do one's own thing, it was more fun to do our thing. So, well though we wrote the book and designed the basic system, there are thousands of students and many teachers who have contributed toward the success of this system. And, I thank you for helping us too.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. I think Dr. Goldberg and I are both familiar with the book and with your writings, and we're very impressed.

MR. FOSTER: Has it been used, ma'am, or is it being used elsewhere?

MS. RAMZER: Since 1963, it has been used but we put a stop to it before we wrote the book because we found out that we -- see, we had no written material and one school adopted it and they were misusing it. And, you know, in -- an educational experiment is not like something that -- you run through so many pieces of steel, if they misuse it it's often the system is blamed rather than the misuse of the system. So, that's when we stopped the spread and wrote the book.

I would like to say one other thing, too. I'm not catching a plane, but I have a long trip to take. I do appreciate it, I speak for Mary, too. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: We certainly appreciate your coming and we hope that perhaps one of the things the Commission can do is disseminate the information about the type of program that you're speaking about. Because, as you say, it doesn't cost a dime and it . . .

MS. RAMZER: It doesn't cost a dime . . .

COMMISSIONER KIRK: . . . and you can do it . . .

MS. RAMZER: . . . and it works.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Right. And it works, it's proven, it's already -- you've already practically had a generation of work on it.

Thank you very much for coming.

MR. GOLDBERG: I must -- I might add before Ms. Ramzer leaves, as she knows I had the quite fortuitious opportunity on my way down to another hearing down in Houston to sit on the plane next to one of their former students. And, it was -- it was purely by accident and we began talking, one thing led to another and I discovered her origins. And, she's clearly a tribute to the teaching that she got.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much.

We will now hear Eugene Kelly, Jr., who's the Dean at George Washington University.

MR. KELLY: My name is Gene Kelly, I'm the Dean of the School of Education and Human Development at George Washington University.

Madam Chairwoman, Commission members, I have submitted written testimony titled "Toward Strengthening Teacher Education, Making Criticism Work", which is two part. At this time I will not speak to the second part which is about the elements of effective teacher education. I will limit my remarks to what -- to what might be titled "Bringing Order to Criticism".

Teacher education deserves all the help it can get.

Not because, as some claim, it's a basket case. On the contrary, it delivers far more than might be expected considering its paltry funding. According to critics, teacher education is in disarray. This has become a popular point of view echoed in various ways by prominent educators and groups. Criticism is a pervasive fact of life for teachers and teacher educators. Much of this criticism deserves serious consideration. However, much of it, in its present form, is unproductive and debilitating. To paraphrase the critics, the criticism of teacher education is in disarray. It consist of a multitude of real and imagined deficencies. It offers a mixed bag of solutions, some thoughtful and feasible, other uninformed and unrealistic and several in conflict with others. And although this criticism is needed and can be helpful it tends to take on a life of its own that beats away at teachers and at teacher education regardless of their success.

Some of the present, widely publicized criticism of teacher education is unproductive, not because teacher education does not need to be strengthened but much of the criticism is too sweeping and disjointed. To strengthen teacher education there needs to be some order to the criticism which is coming in. How can this criti -- how can this Commission bring order and orderly action out of all of this criticism and data. I propose to the Commission five categories for ordering the criticism of teacher education. If the criticism of teacher education is considered in the light of one or more of these categories then such criticisms can be turned into constructive action building on strengths.

Category One, the purposes of education. There is continuing disagreement on the purposes of education, certainly on the purposes of schooling. It is true there is widespread agreement that schools should provide students with the basic tools of learning, such as, reading, writing and mathematical skills, but where do we go from there. Should school teachers help students to develop critical intelligence, the ability to question and analyze? If so, what should they question and analyze. If the schools should educate students in our cultural heritage, how do we make the choices of what to include? How much attention should teachers give to the emotional needs of their students? To what extent should the schools prepare students for the world of work? To what extent should teachers and schools assume responsibility for matters traditionally reserved to parents?

There are criticisms of teacher education that assume clear cut answers to these questions. Those who want to include more reading method courses in the teacher education curriculum usually emphasize the basic skills components of education. Complaints that teacher education programs do not have a large enough liberal arts components usually come from those who see education in the traditional role of passing on our culture and its intellectual heritage. Any criticism of teacher education must first look to philosophical assumptions about the purposes of schools. Criticism of teacher education can be useful when it helps to clarify and order the goals of schooling. Then comes the question about how well teacher education programs are preparing teachers to achieve these goals.

Category two, the history of teacher education. Some criticism of teacher education is stated as if teacher education has been forever standing still. There have been many substantial changes in teacher education. The evolution in teacher education reflects a positive response to criticism and self-examination. The history of change in teacher education suggest two ways of making criticism constructive.

First, criticism will be most effective when it is directed toward the continuing development and strengthening of teacher education rather than setting forth plans for sweeping reform. This does not mean that criticism should be muted, or changes timid. It does mean that there are many strengths on which to build, both in terms of effective practices and talented personnel.

Second, criticisms that recommend changes that have already been widely instituted in teacher education are obviously of little value. For example, those who criticize teacher education for not including enough practical experience are not fully informed about how much field work many programs already squeeze into four-year programs. The critic who says that a future teacher should have two years of general education in college is already describing what teacher education programs generally require. Criticism that is not aware of present practice and present efforts will do little to strengthen teacher education.

Three, education broadly conceived. It is no mystery that education is more than schooling. But, some of the criticisms of teacher education do not sufficiently consider that schools are only a part, a very important part, of a vast array of settings in which education takes place. There are two ways in which this should be approached. First, while many educational settings, such as business, and industry, tend to focus on a limited set of educational goals, the schools have many educational goals placed upon them and teachers are expected to perform a variety of tasks. Second, there are some educational settings which have shifted their educational task to the schools and the schools have been quick to pick them up. When criticism of teachers and teacher education implies unrealistic expectations for the achievement of all educational goals other institutions are let off the hook, and schools and teacher education programs are frustrated.

Fourth category, the funding of teacher education, which we've talked about over and over again. The critics of teacher education and education generally, must confront one of the most serious questions, and that is, of severe underfunding. Severe underfunding is not the reason for all shortcomings, however, calls for changes that imply increased resources without a complementary call for increased funding is destined to fall on deaf, if not least, frustrated ears.

Finally, the length of teacher education. Pre-service teacher education is generally four years and persons want to squeeze all kinds of things into four years. Persons may argue about exactly what should go into teacher preparation but in four years only so much can be accomplished. Thus, curriculum choices must be made carefully and executed intensively. Criticisms that imply some indefinitely lengthy pre-service education are calling for the impossible.

I've dropped some of my comments, they're in written testimony. I encourage you to think systematically and deeply about the information and criticism you receive. And, I hope that my remarks will at least suggest some categories by which you can organize and bring order to all the data and criticism that you've been so patient in receiving.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. You should have been in our morning session. Start off the day instead of end it up.

Richard Hodges who's appearing from Decatur, Georgia.

MR. HODGES: Thank you, Madam Chairman, for the opportunity to address the Commission. I would like to initially claim as my credentials the fact that I have two children in the public schools of DeKalb County and perhaps the fact that I graduated from a good Engineering school and still remember a little of my foreign language that your colleague, Dr. Summer, mentioned.

I came here today without serious intent of speaking but have heard several things upon which I feel compelled to comment. I will submit written comments to Dr. Goldberg, as you've suggested, after they've been typed and edited. I assume the Commission has heard, or will hear, from national Parent's groups with similar concerns, but I cannot let the moment pass for a brief comment.

There is a real need to make the teaching certificate meaningful, both to attract excellent students to the profession and, perhaps, to dissuade persons from the profession who do not possess even very minimum reading, language, writing and classroom management skills. As a correlator, I would urge the Commission to recommend the retention of the emergency certificate to allow persons with subject matter skills to enter, or re-enter the teacher corp without being required to overcome an entry barrier of many hours of [illegible]rious types of course work and other things as a prerequisite. This may help some of the persons mentioned by Chairman Kirk earlier, who have explored nearly open professions and later wish to enter, or re-enter the teaching profession. However, teachers cannot pursue excellence when those who do not receive -- those who do not pursue excellence receive the same rewards and recognitions that they do. Although it smacks of letting the prisoners run the prison, I feel that any program of performance based teacher salary increments or evaluation must include input from parents. I hope that the public schools can be as accountable for excellence in teaching as Reverend Lowden tells us the Christian schools are. I realize that parent input concerns are controversial but in all candor, I feel that parents, such as I with two degrees from a -- a good, or even decent engineering college, and my wife with two degrees, one from a teacher education institution and a Master's from a good multi-purpose institution are able to recognize in, or through our children, the results or intermediate outcomes, I think is the in-term today -- the results or outcomes of good teaching, or even bad teaching. If this approach to evaluation is impossible to implement, for various reasons, then I think, perhaps, the kind of testing that has been discussed here today is the only answer. I realize that parent input into the teacher evaluation process is a morass of legal, ethical and collective bargaining problems. However, I hope that the Commission will note that it is one of the ways, or perhaps the only way that certain aspects of teacher effectiveness can be quantified or even considered. We've heard much today about testing prior to a teaching education program, intermediate testing and initial certification testing. However, if there is no consumer input to the in-service evaluation to identify for correction the problems which slip by, or develop later, and to provide accountability to the consumer/taxpayer and to the student/-parent consumer there can be no real excellence in teaching if there is no accountability after a certain level of certification. I regret to inform the Commission that all the teachers in the public schools are not the -- like the charismatic, personable, positive, warm, enthusiastic, capable, articulate teachers that you've heard from today. I, as a parent, hope for excellence, regretfully settle for slightly better than mediocrity and hope to help my children overcome the negative influences of poor teachers they may encounter. I realize that the teacher alone is not responsible for all of the problems in the classroom and hope to work with school boards and other groups to help alleviate other problems that may exist.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. And, I think you hit on one of the concerns of the Commission and that is that we must be reminded, in fact, parent's, themselves, must be reminded that they are the first educators of the children and that institutions are there to assist them. And, I am quoting the words of the President when he greeted us at the White House on the first day of our Commission meeting.

We'd like to have the next person to speak, which will be James Grey, National Writing Project, Berkeley, California.

MR. GREY: Members of the Commission, I'm James Grey from the University of California, Berkeley Campus; Director of the Bay Area and National Writing Project, two programs that I'd like to bring to the attention of this Commission.

In order to achieve excellence in American education, at least three steps are essential. We must grant professional status to teachers by recognizing that teaching is a discipline, and that those who know it best are classroom teachers; that there's a body of knowledge that comes out of the classroom that is as important as the knowledge that comes to us from traditional research.

Second, we must support the real achievements, I mean, equal achievements of our classroom teachers. Excellence is not easily achieved in the classroom, there are often small steps along the way and unless we encourage those steps we can destroy the teachers will to achieve.

Third, we must pursuade teachers that real achievement is possible, possible even in a climate of hostility to education. We must demonstrate that excellence does exist in their own profession and can exist in their own classrooms. Only when excellence is achieved in the individual classrooms across America will we produce students who have the necessary literacy, and literacy in the broadest sense of that term, to in turn achieve excellence in their own lives.

Success of the National Writing Project is primarily due to its unique integration with the above three essentials of achieving success in excellence.

That is, first, recognizing the individual achievements of classroom teachers.

Second, tapping the knowledge such teachers can contribute to what is known about the teaching of writing.

And, third, demonstrating to other teachers how successful results can be replicated in their own classrooms. But, the writing project has been successful as demonstrated by its unprecedented adoption over the past six years by regional centers, not only across this country, but abroad, and by the fact that last year alone more than forty-one thousand teachers and four million students were directly touched by the project.

The parent project for the National Writing Project is the Bay Area Writing Project. And, when that project was established at the University of California, Berkeley Campus, in 1973 we knew that most teachers were inadequately trained to teach writing; that they were uninformed about what is known about the teaching of writing, and that there is no existing systematic method of informing them. But, we also knew that there were outstanding teachers of writing in the schools. Teachers who, out of necessity, in the privacy of their own classrooms had developed successful approaches to teaching writing. In the Summer of 1974, we invited 25 of these teachers in the schools and colleges of the Bay area to come to the University's Summer Fellows. We brought these teachers together to demonstrate and test the approaches that they had found successful in their own classrooms. And, equally important, to practice the skills they were teaching by writing, themselves. Significantly, with planned follow-up programs, we did not allow these teachers to melt into their individual classrooms again at the end of the Summer. The Summer institute has trained them to be effective teachers of other teachers, and self-supporting in-service programs in individual districts throughout the Bay area. Each Summer, as the project grew, we repeated this process with more and more teachers, and since 1977, with massive funding from a -- provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, in more and more regions of the country.

The classroom teacher is the key to any reform movement to improve quality and education -- excellence in American education. The National Writing Project believes that this relatively simple staff development model that trains teachers to teach teachers can become the foundation for a new national effort to improve teaching in all fields of instruction. It's a model that turns the traditional top-down university role of working with teachers in the schools upside down. Teachers come to the various campuses and school programs sponsored by the National Writing Project sites voluntarily, as colleagues, to share their expertise and to learn from each other. Teachers who are credible because they approaches -- the approaches they demonstrate were developed in real classrooms with real students. It's a success model, it celebrates good teaching by putting a premium on what is working.

The success of the model has been well documented. In 1980, the Carnegie Corporation of New York completed a three-year outside evaluation of this project, an evaluation study that was directed by Michael Scribben. In his executive summary, Scribben stated that;

> "The project appears to be the best large-scale effort to improve composition instruction now available in this country. And, certainly is the

best upon which substantial data are available."

Evaluations conducted at other national writing project sites have also documented the projects significant impact on participating teachers and their students. The growth of this project has been something of a phenomenon. Over the past six years, the support from private, federal, state funding agencies and the support of universities and schools nationwide the national writing project has grown into a world wide network that now numbers ninety-two sites. Eighty-three of these sites are located in the United States, in forty-three states. There are, for example, one or more national writing project sites in every state represented by the members of this Commission. Four sites of American teachers overseas who teach in the dependent schools. One site, the East Asian Writing Project, serves American teachers teaching in independent schools in Asia. There are two sites in Canada supported by Canadian funds. One site in England that supports the continuing education of British teachers. This year a pilot site in Queensland will be established as the first of a projected Australian network. And, Swedish educators are now examining the model as a means of solving Sweden's growing literacy problems.

The spec -- the size of this project is a highly cost-effective program that relies heavily upon local support. I am proposing that the National Writing Project and the powerful potential of the Staff Development model become the keystone of your thinking as you consider recommendations to improve the quality of excellence in all of America's classrooms. With new support needed over the next five years, which I urge this Commission to recommend, the National Writing Project has the potential of reaching teachers in every section of this country through a program that provides teachers with continuous and systematic training throughout their careers.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you, very much. It's a very interesting project, we've heard a lot about it, we didn't really know what it was all about so you've brought us up to date today on that. We've been -- some questions among the Commission members . . .

MR. GREY: That was the five minute version of what it was about.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Right. I'm sure with all those successes you could go on and on, I'm sure.

The next person to speak will be Robert Dickson, who is with the Institute for Research, Development, Engineer -- and Engineering in Nuclear Energy, Atlanta, Georgia.

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, let me change my tape first, please.

(A brief pause while Reporter changed tapes.)

COURT REPORTER: We're on the record.

MR. DICKSON: Commissioner Kirk, Commissioners. I have chosen to speak at this public hearing of the National Commission on Excellence and Education on teaching and teacher education because of my long standing interest in the subject. This interest is reflected in my career path which includes fourteen years in Academe as Physics Professor, Department Chairperson, Dean, Assistant Vice -- and Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs. Most recently I have worked as a Senior Executive with a small research Engineering firm.

I believe that any recommendation that's made to promote excellence in education must address the specification of problems in teaching and teacher education, but before the problems in our educational systems can stimulate a broad range of analysis. However, proposed solutions should be examined carefully for many will possess only the potential to exacerbate the situation they were supposed to have remedied. If we are to achieve significant results that reflect an improvement in the quality of education then our recommendations to the Secretary must be void of spurious proposals. I have sought this opportunity because I believe that my background provides me with a perspective that can be of assistance in the clarification of issues that are attendant to the promotion of excellence in our schools and universities.

There are three areas in which I would like to comment briefly. These are; teacher education, excellence in minimum standards, and the need for change.

The strength of a Democratic society is dependent on the ability of that society to make choices which serve well the varied and competing interest of its members. The ability to choose, to select, to decide intelligently is a function of the analytical skills possessed by members of that society. Such skills are usually developed in the formal education received by an individual. There can be no misunderstanding, in a society that values freedom with responsibility, education undergirds all institutions. Teaching cannot be lightly regarded, it is foremost if succeeding generations are to be able to make rational choices. Consider the teachers that our institutions of higher education have produced. Many can be found in this community and in others, who teach physics, chemistry, mathematics without college training beyond a year or two in these disciplines. Such teachers cannot provide perspective on a discipline, or help the students understand the limitations of an approach or a particular approximation.

I am often dismayed when I hear others speak of the mathematical deficiencies in the preparation of college freshman. Invariably the blame is placed on what was termed the "new math". This blame may be misplaced, for what occurred a few years ago was that some mathematics educators decided that many of the mathematical concepts which were generally presented in college were sufficiently elementary that they could be taught earlier. More importantly, these concepts, if properly understood, would yield a better appreciation of the structure of the field. The objective was to provide an explanation for what was formerly taught in terms of only rules. Such an approach did not stand much of a chance since many of those entrusted to teach mathematics did not understand enough mathematics to place the new approach in perspective. Students in college who want to avoid rigor and work -- the rigor and work of majoring in a content discipline often choose teacher education. There are certainly exceptions and we must recognize that our teacher education programs do not generally attract the better students.

We do have a major problem in teacher education. The recent events at the University of California where a faculty committee recommended that the school of education be abolished is an example of the type of challenge that will probably occur at other institutions. At the University of California, the Administration interceded to save the school but with stipulations, the foremost of which is that future faculty appointments to the school should be joint appointments involving other schools. That is, some other discipline. This thrust toward knowledge of the discipline must carry over into the teacher education program. The least that we should ask is that individuals teaching in our secondary schools satisfy the requirements for a major from their respective colleges in the discipline they propose to teach.

Excellence in minimum standards. How academic institutions seem committed to specialization in socialization. Emphasis is often not placed on learning, rather, the development of the total person is made prominent. Many secondary schools have adopted and are adopting the use of examinations to measure whether a certain minimum knowledge has been acquired by students. This minimum usually involves such tasks as filling out a job application, writing checks, and following the directions on the label of a can of soup. This quest for the low standard, the weak standard, undermines the educational process in the system that employs such measures. The minimum standard in a given system will influence what is termed excellent in that system. The minimum standard will permeate the structure, shape the expectations of teachers, and dramatically interfere with the views and attitudes of students toward learning, themselves and their teachers. Excellence is a desirable goal, and if the effort is made, these minimum standards will take care of themselves.

In many of our state colleges and universities programs are provided for those who evidence deficiencies on some diagnostic instrument. Such programs are thought to be fair and to provide opportunity to students that might otherwise not be able to attend college. Such programs should be carefully examined. They require a significant investment in resources, and efforts that are often doomed to failure. Failure because the programs are not staffed with the personnel who are prepared to address problems beyond the material to be presented. The answer is a higher standard for the high school diploma.

Richard -- The need for change. Richard Mitchell, in his book, "The Grades of Academe", points out that a major problem with public education can be traced to the teacher training academy, and I quote;

> "There's little enthusiasm in the teacher training business for outstanding intellectual accomplishment in would-be teachers. One plain theory is that since the teacher must relate to the students before any learning can happen the teacher ought to be as much like the student as possible. Very unlikely in the case of an especially intellectual teacher."

Mitchell tells us that two fundamental principles comprise the underlying theory of education in America. These are Humanism, and Behavioural Modification. Humanism seems to require that students not be subjected to the overbearing demands of knowledge, scholarship and logic. And, Behaviour Modification describes some desired outcomes in the students. It is the contention of Mitchell that anti-academicians are in control of public education. Mitchell also is very pessimistic about change. He writes that the state of American government is simply -- American government education is simply not a problem that can be solved. It is governed by collective ascent, not individual talent. It absorbs the shock of every criticism by pretending to reform itself, only to transform into luke -- whatever it claims to embrace into nothing but more of the same. This is the challenge to the Commission. Education in America needs change, the quest for development of the total person need not be anti-intellectual. Excellence is not so far removed, so abstract a notion that we cannot recommend the path. Reading and writing, students must read, and read, and read, not from some approved list of right thinking text developed through the collective effort of some committe. And, students must write, and write, and write. Those who instruct must present these skills, where they can be found, a few are currently hiding in the system. Others must be produced by colleges and universities who demand more of the teacher educators.

I'll stop.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. I'm very pleased to hear you mention that book, I knew somebody would. I'm surprised it has not been mentioned earlier, "The Grades of Academe".

The next person to speak will be Pat Woodall, who's a teacher from Columbus, Georgia.

MS. WOODALL: Thank you, Madam Chairman, Commission members. I do not have written testimony, but thank you for this opportunity to share my concerns and personal experience with you. For the past seven years I have taught first grade in Muscogee County, that's in Columbus, Georgia. I received my B.S. and Master's degrees from Columbus College, which is also in Columbus, Georgia. In various reading courses offered in the elementary and early childhood curricula I was exposed to many different methods of teaching reading with the emphasis being that no one method is superior to another. For five years, the Muscogee County School district used the Holt reading series, which incorporates a sight/word approach to reading. It was very inovative with a lightscreen for the vocabulary words to stick up on, with filmstrips, records, extra books, games, all sorts of things that the children just loved. Unfortunately this series did not meet the needs of the children that I was teaching. The in-service programs and reading consultants did not seem to be able to help me either. I quit worrying when I was told by a consultant that because these children were disadvantaged socially and economically that this was normal achievement. At the time, I didn't know better.

During my sixth year, I piloted the -- an economy program at the request of my Principal. Its approach to decoding words was phonetic. For the first three months, I taught without much conviction until I realized that the children were reading better than my previous classes. In fact, some of them were even asking to go to the library to get a book to read at home. I was amazed when half the children were reading in the first, second grade reader by May. By June, I was again enthusiastic about teaching, I had found something that did a good job. That spring, the school system adopted a new reading series, this time by Holt and Mifland. It boasted of a tremendous reading success rate using phonetic, comprehension and decoding strategies. By January, of this year, the children were back to the same level as they were in Holt. It turned out that the Holt and Mifland uses a phony phonics approach, the strategy is to teach the sounds of eighteen consonants. The children look at the beginning and ending sounds of the word and guess the rest of the word through the use of written, oral, or visual clues. The comprehension component is excellent, but children cannot understand something that they have to guess at half the time. In February I saw a TV movie by Hallmark Cards on Marva Collins, an intercity teacher who founded the Westside Prepartory Academy. Her children were just as disadvantaged as mine and probably even more so, so I ordered the series she used, Professor Phonics, for $10.95. It was late in the year, but I started using it in addition to the regular reading series. Within one month, there was a dramatic improvement in my student's spelling, reading and creative writing. If I had been taught how to teach phonics in college I could have used this successful method much earlier in my career. The total phonics approach is one that has proven most effective for me.

As pointed out earlier today, by Barbara Peterson, there often is a gap between what is taught in college education courses and what is actually going on in the schools. Theory without application is taught by professors who have been out of the classroom for quite some time. College education programs, for example, courses in reading curricula, do not adequately prepare teachers for the below average socially and economically disadvantaged child.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: I think that could be said for all children. I certainly want your testimony because I have a daughter entering first grade and I am now arguing with the schools exactly that question, about the -- the text that they are using. So, I would -- I'm familiar with "Professor Phonics", and the other ones too. So, I would very much like to talk to you afterward for a minute.

MS. WOODALL: I'll be glad to stay.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you.

Our last, but certainly not least, person to speak today will be, now we have two people here.

Are you Wayne?

MR. WHEATLEY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Okay. Wayne Wheatley, with the Counsel for exceptional children.

And is that Greenville, South Carolina?

MR. WHEATLEY: Right.

Madam Chairwoman and members of the Commission. I'm here as President-Elect of the Teacher Education Division of the Counsel for Exceptional Children to speak to you regarding matters of special education and teacher education. One of the things that comes to mind, after hearing much of the testimony today in regard to the problems that we face in teacher education, and in our schools, is that it seems to me that it is virtually impossible for any of the strategies advanced to work effectively unless they work with that 25% of the children which we have just heard about, which consists of the children who cause most of the difficulties in school, disciplinary and learning problems being the slow learners and handicapped students. And, along those lines, in the preparation of teachers we face many problems, some of which, I think, are relatively unique problems in teacher education. One of those problems is -- is that, unlike many other areas of education and teacher education, we still face major shortages of personnel. And, these personnel shortages are especially significant in certain areas of handicapping conditions in certain geographical areas of the country. I will come back to some of the kinds of things that might be done to help with some of those problems.

Also, there's a major lack of collaboration and cooperation between regular education teachers and special education teachers which is necessary if we're going to work effectively with these children. And, I would maintain that if we're going to educate these children in the public schools and not deal with them effectively it's questionable if any strategy will work for the other 75% either. Okay. Along those lines are many, many, I guess, strategies, many possible solutions to the problems. I think the problem, itself, is too complex to go into within the five minutes that we have here. But, there are some things, I think, that especially the state and federal governments could do to assist us with these problems. One of the major difficulties faced by institutions of higher education in providing special education teacher education is that especially for some low incidents handicapping conditions, such as, providing teachers for children who are deaf, blind, orthepedically handicapped and so forth, the actual number of teachers needed in the public schools is relatively small, yet these teachers -- these children do need qualified competent teachers. However, it's very difficult for a university, considering the limited resources that most of us have today, to maintain programs of teacher preparation for such a small number of teachers. It is -- there is no way in which an institution can do that effectively without some means of external support. Along those lines, I think that there is a need for continued federal involvement through branches of the federal government, such as the Division of Personnel Preparation, to provide continued support for some programs of dealing directly with low incidents handicapping conditions, and in certain rural sparsely populated areas. I think that without support it's questionable if we'll ever be able to provide enough competent quality teachers for those children.

Also, there is a continued need for research and development efforts in special education teacher education if this field is to go forward. We're still under a neo-natal, or infancy stages.

The second area of difficulty is the lack of cooperation that exists between regular education and special education teachers. This problem exist not only in the public schools but in universities and colleges, as well. The result of this is -- is that we oftentimes have regular classroom teachers and administrators who have had no preparation in the area of special education and, consequently, lacks some of the sensitivity needed to deal effectively with these children, and the teachers who teach them. One of the results of this situation is that the special education teacher in the public schools oftentimes finds herself being a relatively isolated individual who is not understood any better than are her children. The result, oftentimes, is that the teacher finally decides that she will leave the teaching profession, which again, compounds the problem of the teacher education supply. In some areas of handicapping conditions the life -- average professional lifespan of that teacher is two years or less. And, I would maintain that the reason for that is not the salary level but the devaluation of that teacher's work by her colleagues and administrators. I think if that situation is to be corrected then we must have a better understanding of the special education teacher within the public school system.

Along those lines, I think that there have been a number of federal efforts that have been significant, the Dean's Grant efforts, the regular education in-service efforts, with the stipulation that all teachers receive some in-service in the needs of handicap children through Public Law 94-142. I think those efforts very definitely need to continue, along with research and development efforts to try to develop public school program models which provide for adequate cooperation and collaboration between special education and regular education. It is questionable if much of this will be done unless improved certification standards are brought into play, in which all teachers have some preparation of special education. And, all special educators have a better understanding of the regular classroom instructional system.

Okay. That's my comments and I thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Thank you very much. That's very enlightening for us because I was not aware of some of those problems because it -- it's a narrow field, the specialization and I don't think we hear some of that. What you're suggesting then is that somehow in the teachers certification process of learning, that there be given an overview of the problems of -- I think, some -- of educating the handicap. Someone mentioned earlier something about the problem of mainstreaming which is now mandated and there's no way to handle that.

MR. WHEATLEY: Most of the teachers are not only inadequately prepared, but in many cases -- we have a project on which we've been working with the teachers in the school district of Greenville County, through my university, and we found that at the high school and middle school levels that in many cases as many as 70% of the teachers in the school had no idea as to which children in her class were being mainstreamed had a handicap or a learning problem. Consequently, there was no effort being made to meet those children's needs. The discipline problems increased. The attendance problems were obviously increasing. The drop-out rate became more significant, and so on. The idea that the teacher didn't know would have been fine if these children had been making adequate progress in the classes but they were not, the cooperation was so poor. And, in many cases, even after the teacher found out that these children did have a handicapping condition, the result was "so what", either because of insensitivity, or in many cases because she had no idea as to how to go about meeting this child's needs. We've been very remiss in teacher education not to prepare teachers to deal with all the children in America's schools.

MR. FOSTER: Are you -- are you, however unbalanced, thinking of the future, are you convinced that mainstreaming is the way to do it?

MR. WHEATLEY: I don't think there's any other possible alternative that could be effective. I don't think -- I think, first of all, if we're really talking about preparing these children to become taxpaying, contributing members of society, there's no way we're going to teach them to live in a normal world if we educate them in an abnormal world by pulling them out of the mainstream of public education and educating them in very narrow, limited environments in which abnormality becomes the norm.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: When you're speaking of exceptional children here, could you define -- are you speaking of handicapped?

MR. WHEATLEY: I am speaking primarily of handicapping conditions, but I also think the same is true with gifted and talented children. There do need -- we do need to have special programs to accommodate the needs of those children too, but those programs cannot remove those children from the mainstream of society and prepare people who are capable of surviving in that society.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: One last question. You -- you said that there were many -- there were only a few, really, people, and how could the institutions do this, this handful, how could they educate this handful? Would you suggest that their be certain institutions that actually specialize in that, more than others, and have the person go to that institution as opposed to perhaps some place where they lived, travel to another state to attend the institution? In other words, having in the -- within the schools of education not having all of them handle this.

MR. WHEATLEY: Along that line, we've been doing a number of things. Special education teacher ed programs are fairly common, of course, in many of the colleges and universities and even some of the smaller programs. But, oftentimes you have the same thing existing there that exists in the public school, two parallel worlds in which, you know, this group of people prepares the special education teachers and this group of people prepares the regular education teachers. And, they don't communicate very well. And what we have happening is that in the methodology courses in regular education the graduating students today, with a degree in elementary education or secondary education, are probably no better prepared to deal with the handicapped children they're going to be having in their classes than they were when -- than were the people who graduated ten years ago before this occurred, who did not have those handicapped children. One of the problems is that many of the elementary and secondary education faculty find themselves faced with the dilemma of trying to prepare teachers to work with handicapped children when they, themselves, have never had that experience.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Very good.

MR. WHEATLEY: And, that's a major part of the problem. And, I think there's a real need for intervention on two levels, one is in the public schools to try to provide the regular classroom teachers with knowledge of content, and methodology for working with the handicapped, and the other is we have to cut this problem off at the source, and that's in the institutions of higher education, provide graduates who are competent to deal with all the kids they're going to face.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: My sister teaches the deaf.

Okay. Thank you very much for your testimony.

I believe we can now call the hearing to an end.

MR. GOLDBERG: I just want to make sure that everybody's testimony is submitted.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Make sure that all of your testimony is submitted.

MR. GOLDBERG: Please.

COMMISSIONER KIRK: Yes, please.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached transcript of the proceedings for the NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION, a Public Hearing on TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION:

Date: Wednesday, May 12, 1982

Place: Room 320
Urban Life Center
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the files of the Board.

Sally Sanborn

Sally Sanborn, Notary Public &
Court Reporter, No. T-604